The Case for Dismantling Our Planet's Most Dangerous Arsenal of Atomic Weapons of Mass Destruction

THE GOLEM

A WORLD HELD HOSTAGE

Israel's Nuclear Hell Bomb and the Road to Global Armageddon

A study of the "Israelization" of American foreign policy and its implications for the survival of mankind

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

For over 30 years Michael Collins Piper has been fighting against needless wars and global imperialism. He's traveled 'round the world telling good people all over the planet that real Americans do not support the criminal actions of the Zionist elite who reign supreme on American soil...

Above, left, Michael Collins Piper shares a light moment in Kuala Lumpur with longtime former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohamad. Right, Piper—a renowned animal lover—visits the memorial, at Tokyo's famed Yasukuni Shrine, to the dogs who served alongside Japanese troops in wartime. Below, right, with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Below, left, Piper lectures before the Arab League think tank, the Zayed International Center for Coordination and Follow-Up, in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates.

Below, left, at Red Square in Moscow. Center, Piper smiles for the camera with Dr. Sanusi Junid, president of the International Islamic University in Malaysia (left), and Count Hans Christophe Von Sponeck (right), former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations and coordinator of the UN's humanitarian program in Iraq prior to the American invasion. At right, conducting his nightly radio forum on the Republic Broadcasting Network.

What is The Golem?

That provocative question—the answer to which is central to the survival of life on earth—is confronted in no uncertain terms in this explosive first-ever study of its kind . . .

In Jewish lore, a distinguished rabbi magically conjured up out of clay from the earth a brutish creature—The Golem—that the rabbi dispatched upon the world to vanquish the enemies of the Jewish people. As told in the legend—which later inspired Mary Shelley's Frankenstein—The Golem got out of control and proved even a threat to Jewish survival.

In fact, a most real (and quite dangerous) Golem does exist on our planet in these modern times. Cast out of a mineral known as uranium, this Golem is—as Israel's founding father, David Ben-Gurion, described it—Israel's "sacred" nuclear weapon of mass destruction, the primary source of trouble in the precarious realm of atomic proliferation on the face of our strife-ridden planet today.

In this landmark work, veteran author Michael Collins Piper pulls no punches in asserting that Israel's nuclear Hell Bomb is pushing civilization toward global Armageddon, that the perpetuation of this un-controlled weapons program has left the world held hostage. Piper explains the danger the planet faces as a direct consequence of American collaboration with a nuclear-armed Israel, a nation which has an open historical record of hostility to other peoples, based on little-known Jewish religious teachings that have been the philosophy upon which Israel—since its earliest days—has worked relendessly to construct an atomic arsenal—its Golem—the foundation of its national security strategy.

Outlining the whole shocking story, Piper demonstrates that America's international policy has been hijacked by well-heeled supporters of Israel who—in combination with a mass media dominated by Jewish families and financial interests—have become the masters of America's destiny and that of mankind itself. Piper calls this phenomenon "the 'Israelization' of American foreign policy."

Having previously produced six different—and all widely-acclaimed—studies (translated into multiple languages) that have focused on various aspects of Zionist intrigue, Piper is now internationally acknowledged as a foremost and articulate longtime critic of U.S. policy toward Israel and the Muslim world. In The Golem, Piper has assembled a mammoth record of indisputable facts pointing toward the unmistakable conclusion: That the people of the United States and the world must work together to ensure Israel's Golem is dismantled.

This one monumental volume could help make that happen . . .

THE GOLEM

In 1994, Jane's Intelligence Review, the world authority on the arms industry, confirmed that Israel [had] 200 nuclear warheads, making it the world's sixth largest nuclear power.

The double standards that scream at you whenever you see the words "weapons of mass destruction" cannot be excused on the grounds that Israel is abiding by international regulations.

Israel refuses to sign any treaty regulating the use of nuclear weapons. All correspondence concerning the nuclear non-proliferation agreement, the nuclear test ban treaty and other copiously negotiated agreements on weapons of mass destruction go into the Israeli government's rubbish bins.

Yet Israel receives $3 billion [in aid] annually, from the United States. This is despite legislation—the Symington Accord—to prevent [the] US government from granting aid to countries who develop nuclear weapons outside of international control and agreement.

—Hilary Wainwright The
Guardian October 4, 2002

ABOUT THE COVER: This is the "The Golem"—taken from the classic German expressionist film of the 1920s which told the story (based on a popular Jewish legend) of how a Jewish rabbi created a giant creature out of clay, known as The Golem, which was designed to protect the beleaguered Jews of Prague from their enemies. However, that Golem got out of control and became a threat to the Jews as well. On the Golem's chest is a five-pointed star, the ancient Jewish symbol of the city of Jerusalem. Today a very real Golem exists: Israel's arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction. The danger that Israel's nuclear Golem poses to the world—and to the very survival of the Jewish people—is the subject of this volume.

A note from the author. . .

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Israel has nominated me to its "Hall of Shame"...

Just as this book was about to go to press, friends abroad advised me that I have been named to an official Israeli "Hall of Shame,"

This rather unusual "honor"---so to speak— was conferred by an Israeli state forum known as the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism which is co-sponsored by the office of the Israeli prime minister, Israel's education and foreign ministries, and by such eminent global Jewish organizations as the Anti-Defamation League, the World Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith and the Jewish Agency, among others.

My "crime" was having attended—along with some 70 researchers and academics from 30 countries worldwide—a conference convened in Tehran in December of 2006 by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadenijad and the Iranian foreign ministry's Institute for Political and International Studies.

Although the formal topic of this conference was the ubiquitous subject referred to as "The Holocaust," the larger emphasis dealt with the ever-present

(continued . . .)

(Continued . . .)

problems stemming from Israel's central role in the conflicts of the Middle East, in particular Israel's treatment of the Christians and Muslims of Palestine—policies which are notably reminiscent of those said to have been practiced by Nazi Germany against the Jews of Europe.

Let me say with no hesitation that I consider this condemnation by Israel a badge of honor that I wear with pride: formal verification that I have devoted more than half my life to combatting senseless wars that America has been dragged into on behalf of Israel and the international Zionist agenda.

I make no apologies whatsoever for having taken a forthright stand against Israel's misdeeds and American global meddling on Israel's behalf.

It is my firm belief that what I refer to as "The Problem of Israel" is one that threatens the very survival of life on Earth. It stands as the driving force behind the twin evils of war and imperialism—a very real two-headed dragon that must be slain.

And that is why I have written this book, Israel's nuclear weapons of mass destruction-its Golem—stand at the center of the problem and this problem must soon be resolved.

Let us hope that this book helps make resolution of the problem possible.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER
Washington, DC September 11, 2007

For more on the efforts by Dr. Mahathir Mohamad to fight war and imperialism, explore the website of the Perdana Global Peace Forum: perdana4peace.org

Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, former prime minister of Malaysia (above), has been an outspoken advocate for world peace. Shown, at inset, is a photograph of Michael Collins Piper's late half-brother, F. C. Schellenberg, jumping from a truck during military training prior to his deployment to Vietnam. Schellenberg was just one of millions of Americans sent to fight needless foreign wars.

DEDICATION

To Dr. Mahathir Mohamad
The Father of Modern Malaysia
and a Front-Line Warrior for World Peace

We must banish war as an option in the settlement of disputes and conflicts between nations; to recognize and define war as legitimized mass murder, as inhuman and uncivilized.'

I call upon the world to reject war totally and to accept peace as the true expression of the humaneness and nobility of humankind, the ultimate measure of the level of civilization humanity should strive for, should attain.

In the name of democracy, freedom and God, the war criminals have waged and continue to wage wars of aggressions and commit heinous war crimes. In the name of peace, we must mount a global effort to prevent war criminals from waging wars and the slaughter of the innocents.

We must be resolute. We must not flinch in the face of adversity. Our cause is just and victory is assured though the struggle will be long and arduous. God willing, peace will prevail.

A journey of a thousand miles begins with the first steps. We have taken many steps. Let us march forward in this struggle to achieve true civilization, to criminalize war.

—DR. MAHATHIR MOHAMAD

To the late F. C. Schellenberg.

He was drafted to fight in the war in Vietnam, yet another war that need not and should not have been fought. Although my big brother returned home to our family— and started his own—the scars of a war that he never talked about to me—except once—brought him to an early death. In many ways, my mother's first-born son had already died in the jungle in Southeast Asia many years before.

And to Mordechai Vanunu.

The world owes a great debt to Mordechai—a prophet for our times. Let us hope both that Mordechai's warnings about Israel's nuclear Golem are heeded and that he finally achieves the liberty of which he dreamed during 18 years spent confined in the Hell of an Israeli prison.

Nominated repeatedly for the Nobel Peace Prize, former Israeli nuclear technician Mordechai Vanunu spent 18 years in prison in Israel, eleven years in solitary confinement, convicted of treason and espionage for having (in 1986) given The London Sunday Times inside information regarding Israel's program for the construction of atomic weapons of mass destruction. Since his release from prison, in 2004, Vanunu has repeatedly been targeted by Israeli authorities for his continuing refusal to abide by Israel's demand that he cease having contact with foreign journalists. Vanunu wishes to leave Israel but the Israeli government will not permit that. The Jerusalem Post reported—on July 25, 2004—that Vanunu charged in an interview with the London-based Arabic newspaper, al-Hayat, that he believed that John F. Kennedy's assassination was the direct result of JFK's efforts to prevent Israel from building nuclear weapons. Vanunu was first introduced to this thesis, put forth in Michael Collins Piper's book, Final Judgment, by another prominent Israeli dissident, Israel Shamir. Piper is one of those with whom Vanunu spoke, defying Israel's ban on his contact with foreign journalists.

Israel's Prisoner of Conscience Speaks:

The time has come for U.S. and Europe to inform all the people in the Middle East that Israel has all the atomic weapons. It is time to prepare all the states and people for the future NWs. Nuclear war.

Because Israel is not yet ready to respect all the democracy standards, human rights, this means Israel is moving toward a nuclear war in the future.

All this talk and the meetings are not going to bring any peace. They are just helping Israelis to cheat themselves. As long as The Wall exists, the occupation, the settlements, the refugee camps, there will never be any peace.

The Jews of Israel must wake up from their Zionist dreams, wake up from the policy of Ben Gurion and Shimon Peres who trust atomic weapons.They make nuclear war inevitable.

So the U.S. and European obligation is to make it very clear and open, that the war Is coming.

—MORDECHAI VANUNU March 27, 2007 See The Mordechai Vanunu website: serve.com/vanunu

Mordechai Vanunu PO Box 20102 Herodian Post Office East Jerusalem 91384

Was the First Shot in Israel's War to Achieve Nuclear Supremacy Fired in Dallas, Texas on Nov. 22, 1963?

... [John F.] Kennedy placed the limitation of the nuclear arms race at the center of American foreign policy. . . . Israel's nuclear enterprise was in direct contradiction with the principles of his policy....

The correspondent for Ha'aretz in Washington during the Kennedy and Johnson presidencies, Amos Elon, filed a report saying that in a background talk with James Reston of The New York Times, Kennedy had said that in nuclear matters [Israeli Prime Minister David] Ben-Gurion was a "wild man."

—Israeli historian Michael Karpin The Bomb in the Basement: How Israel Went Nuclear and What That Means for the World

The murder of American President John F. Kennedy-brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue the nuclear program.

[In Israel and the Bomb, Avner] Cohen demonstrates at length the pressures applied by Kennedy on Ben-Gurion ... in which Kennedy makes it quite clear to the Israeli prime minister that he will under no circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state.

The book implied that, had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option.

—Reuven Pedatzer in Israel's Ha'aretz, Feb. 5, 1999, reviewing Avner Cohen's Israel and the Bomb.

Special privileges far one nation— and one nation alone—on the face of the entire planet...

Israel, everyone agrees, is an established nuclear weapon state. It was the sixth nation in the world—and the first in the Middle East—to develop and acquire nuclear weapons. Indeed, while exact figures are speculative, Israel's nuclear forces are believed to be (in qualitative terms at least) more like those of France and the United Kingdom than India's and Pakistan's.

Yet Israel's code of conduct and discourse in the nuclear field differs distinctly from the other established nuclear weapon states. Unlike the seven acknowledged nuclear nations—the five de jure nuclear weapon states under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) (the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China) and the two de facto nuclear weapon states outside the NPT (India and Pakistan)—Israel has never advertised or even admitted its nuclear status __

Nobody—in or out of Israel—cares to ask Israeli leaders uncomfortable questions about the nation's nuclear status... In Washington, and subsequently in other Western capitals, the Israeli bomb has become a most sensitive issue, almost untouchable ... under which the United States treats Israel as a special (and unique) nuclear case. Under this policy, the United States has exercised its diplomatic influence and power to ignore and shield the Israeli case. Israel is treated as an exception, somehow exempt from the nonproliferation regime that applies to everyone else.

Friends and foes of Israel (and of the United States) have to reckon with this aura of exceptionalism. For friends it is a matter of political embarrassment; for foes it highlights the double standard and inequality of America's unevenhanded approach to non-proliferation.

—Israeli historian Avner Cohen "The Last Taboo: Israel's Bomb Revisited" Current History - April 2005

Foreword

A World Held Hostage ...

The existence of Israel's arsenal of weapons of mass destruction is the world's greatest "open secret." Unfortunately, many Americans, sadly, think that Israel's atomic Helifire is simply splendid, a gift from God. However, most knowledgeable people across the face of our planet—people of all creeds and colors—don't share that view. And because the people of our world—the overwhelming vast majority—do not share that view, they have begun to perceive the United States as hardly more than a shameless and shameful tool of Israel.

While some have been heard to suggest that the situation is quite the opposite, that Israel is, rather to the contrary, a tool of the United States, the entirety of the material assembled in the pages of this volume should convince them otherwise.

In any case, what is distinctly beyond debate is that the so-called "special relationship" between the United States and Israel is, as one critic has written, a "poisonous relationship" that does not bode well for the future of mankind—and that, needless to say, is putting it mildly.

There have been a number of important works, largely by Jewish authors (including several Israelis) which have explored, in some depth, the until recently little-known history of Israel's drive for nuclear weapons. However, this book, The Golem, is designed to explain how the reality of Israel's nuclear bomb—which we have dubbed "The Golem" —has become an ever-present reality (a dangerous and frightening one) that has had a destructive impact on the course of the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

The existence of this Golem has likewise provided Israel's power-mad lobby in Washington with added clout far above and beyond the millions (really billions) of political cash at the lobby's disposal. Together this has made Israel and its adherents in America the unchallenged dictators of the American system.

Both of America's major political parties are tightly controlled at the highest levels by the Jewish lobby and are ready and willing to do whatever that lobby demands. In addition, we find that all of the major news-magazines, all of the major newspapers, and all of the major broadcast networks are firmly in the hands of Jewish families and financial interests with a deep commitment to promoting the interests of Israel and global Zionism. In truth, those who control the media in America control the American process and use it to advance the Zionist agenda.

The death of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas, Texas on November 22, 1963 put an end to JFK's steadfast effort to prevent Israel from setting in place the cornerstone of its longstanding national secu-

rity agenda: the construction of a nuclear arsenal. And the subsequent political assassination of President Richard Nixon who—like JFK— dared to challenge Israel behind the scenes cemented Israel's power over the American system and further advanced its nuclear agenda.

Since that time Israel has steamed forward, flexing its inordinate and certainly unrivaled political muscle over America, using the threat of its nuclear capacity to blackmail and extort and coerce the United States and the West—really the entire civilized world—into accepting Israels national (and international) agenda, one that is rooted in the age-old racist and ethnocentric worldview of Zionism and its philosophical antecedents in the Jewish body of laws known as the Talmud.

Although the Zionist-dominated media regularly promotes horror stories (and false ones at that) about "anti-Christian" passages in the Koran, that same media ignores vile, hate-filled rhetoric in the Talmud aimed at non-Jews. And make no mistake about it, Israel's Talmudic ideology is a dangerous one, particularly since it is so foundational to Israel's geopolitical agenda which pivots on Israel's nuclear arsenal.

In short, we live in a world held hostage by Israel's nuclear Golem. And even if you have never heard the term "Golem"—which is likely—you will soon understand why that unusual term is so remarkably accurate (and so profound) in using to describe Israel's Hell Bomb.

Never in the entire history of mankind has civilization been so directly threatened with such an enemy. Still, amazingly, a substantial number of Americans have yet to recognize this horrific danger.

Former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohamad has said that the people of the world are the planet's "second greatest superpower" and that through their joint efforts war can finally be put to rest forever. Let us hope that he is correct. My wish is that this book can be an effective tool in the hands of this second greatest super-power.

If this book accomplishes anything, let it be simply this: to set the stage for Americans to come to their senses and rise up in their most righteous might and demand, once and for all, that the Zionist-corrupted elements inside the corridors of American power be brought to heel, that the mechanism of control in the hands of Israel and its lobby in Washington be forcibly dismantled, that a new American system—freed from the grip of Zionism—closes ranks with the peoples of this planet and forces Israel and the international Zionist movement to join the community of mankind and do away with its monster, its nuclear Golem.

If and when that happens we may be one step closer toward stopping the destruction of our world as we know it today.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

THE GOLEM

What [is Israel] to do? I have other dreams as well— apocalyptic ones. I think: Israel has been building nuclear weapons for thirty years.The Jews understand what passive and powerless acceptance of doom has meant for them in the past and they have ensured against it. Masada was not an example to follow—it hurt the Romans not a whit, but Samson in Gaza? With an H-bomb?

What would serve the Jew-hating world better in repayment for thousands of years of massacres but a Nuclear Winter? Or invite all those tut-tutting European statesmen and peace activists to join us in the ovens?

For the first time in history, a people facing extermination while the world either cackles or looks away ... have the power to destroy the world. The ultimate justice?

—Professor David Perlmutter
Louisiana State University
"Dark Thoughts and Quiet Desperation"
The Los Angeles Times
April 7, 2002

We [Israelis] possess several hundred atomic warheads and rockets and can launch them at targets in all directions, perhaps even at Rome. Most European capitals are targets of our air force. Our armed forces are not the 30th strongest in the world, but rather the second or third. We have the capacity to take the world down with us. And I can assure you that this will happen before Israel goes under.

—Dr. Martin van Crevald
Hebrew University
Jerusalem [Occupied Palestine] Israel

Above, a 19th century illustration of Rabbi Loew of Prague conjuring up the legendary Golem of Jewish lore. A real-life Golem exists in Israel today: its arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

At left, a scene from one of the famous three-part series of films by German expressionist filmmaker Paul Wegener, telling the story of "The Golem." Here Rabbi Loew (right) and a henchman cling to the monster the rabbi created. The tale of The Golem—memorialized in print, on the stage and in film over the centuries—is (perhaps unwittingly) a warning to our world of the dangers of religious fanaticism. The modern-day nuclear Golem in Israel stands at the center of world unrest today, and must be smashed.

Table of Contents

Introduction:
What is "The Golem"? 17

Chapter One:
Israel's Institutionalized Racism & Nuclear Dangers.....26

Chapter Two:
The Rise of Fanaticism in Israel and its Nuclear Context 33

Chapter Three:
Civil Instability in Israel and its Possible Consequences 36

Chapter Four:
Israel's "Mainstream" Leaders Ponder Nuclear Warfare.....40

Chapter Five:
Israel'sAttack on an Ally: The USS Liberty Affair. 43

Chapter Six:
Israel the Instigator of Middle East Nuclear Proliferation 48

Chapter Seven:
U.S.Tax Exempt Organizations Bankroll Israel's Golem 54

Chapter Eight:
The U.S.-Israel Nuclear "Merger" 56

Chapter Nine:
U.S.Army Analysts Tell Israel to Give Up its Golem 58

Chapter Ten;
The "Poisonous Relationship" That Needs to be Reassessed 60

Chapter Eleven:
The U.S.-Israel-India Nuclear Axis..... 62

Chapter Twelve:
JFK's Secret War With Israel Over Nuclear Weapons 66

Chapter Thirteen:
Jimmy Carter's "Jewish Problem"..... 79

Chapter Fourteen:
Hillary Clinton Was Right: Bill and Monica-Gate 84

Chapter Fifteen:
The Revolt of the Generals 93

Chapter Sixteen:
Zionist Lobby Calls for "Witch Hunt"..... 98

Chapter Seventeen:
The Revolt of the Academics..... 101

Chapter Eighteen:
Zionism's War Against the United Nations..... 104

Chapter Nineteen:
Targeting Iraq and Iran—Long-Term Zionist Strategy..... 112

Chapter Twenty:
Israel the Chief Beneficiary of War Against Iraq and Iran 114

Chapter Twenty-One:
"Indelibly Jewish Fingerprints" on Iran War Schemes 119

Chapter Twenty-Two:
Iraq War Architects Now Aiming at Iran..... 121

Chapter Twenty-Three:
"New York Money People" Want War on Iran 124

Chapter Twenty-Four:
Iranian Nuclear Controversy "Made in Israel"..... 127

Chapter Twenty-Five:
Iran's President Challenges New World Order. 129

Chapter Twenty-Six:
Dr. Mahathir Mohamad: It's Time to Wage War Against War. 137

Chapter Twenty-Seven:
"Failed State" of Israel Willing to Break Nuclear Taboo..... 140

Chapter Twenty-Eight:
The End of Life on Earth 142

Chapter Twenty-Nine:
The Media's "Instituionalized Disinformation" 144

Chapter Thirty:
Lawrence Dennis Appeals to Reason:
"The Biggest Crime of the 20th Century" 146

CONCLUSION:
The "Israelization" of American Foreign Policy. 159

A Final Word . . .

What is to be Done? 177

Index 181

Other Books of Interest 183

Commentary by Israeli dissident Mordechai Vanunu:
A review of the work of Michael Collins Piper. 195

Commentary by Japanese philosopher Ryu Ohta:

A review of the work of Michael Collins Piper. 196

Media in America Displays Bias 197

"How I Discovered The Problem of Israel"
—A Reflective Essay by Michael Collins Piper. 198

A Letter From the Author 200

הגיבור הלא מנוצח

הגולם

גליון עצמאות מיוחדן

It s no coincidence that in today's Israel, a cultural icon in popular literature is an incarnation of "The Golem," who fights the enemies of Israel. Shown above is The Golem (its name in Hebrew at top). Inset is The Golem marching forward in the company of a bright-looking young Israeli military officer. At right is The Golem taking down no less than Adolf Hitler. The ancient Jewish legend of The Golem is very much in the forefront of Israeli geostrategic thinking and, as such, must be recognized as the danger that it is.

Introduction:

What is The Golem"? How Does This Jewish Religious Icon Relate to the Most Dangerous Arsenal of Nuclear Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Face of the Planet Today?

The legend of The Golem, in one form or another, can be found in the most ancient days of Jewish folklore and is notably referenced in the Talmud—an extended record of discussions amongst Jewish rabbis about matters pertaining to Jewish laws, ethics, customs and history, dating back to the mid-years of the First Century, A.D. However, the best-known rendering of the tale came in a story first published in Prague in 1847 in a collection of Jewish tales.

A subsequent version was published in 1909 by Yudl Rosenberg in a collection of short stories about The Golem entitled The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague.

The so-called Maharal of Prague was a real-life 16th Century rabbi, a highly-regarded authority on Jewish mysticism, who lived between 1525 and 1609. Generally known at the time as Yehudah Levin ben Betzalel Levai (or Loew)—or variations thereof—the rabbi is most commonly recalled in the legend of The Golem as simply "Rabbi Loew." (The rabbi's title, "MaHaRaL," incidentally is the Hebrew acronym of"Moreinu ha-Rav Loew," which means, simply, "Our Teacher the Rabbi Loew")

A wealthy heir to a distinguished Jewish family which included his uncle, who was the Rabbi of the Jews of the Holy Roman Empire, Rabbi Loew was not only influential in Prague, but at one point, he later journeyed to Poland where he was named Chief Rabbi of Poland. Today his tomb in Prague, the city to which he returned during his final years, is a popular tourist attraction.

Loew's work, as a Talmudic scholar and as a teacher of Talmudic scholars, is hailed in modern times as being critical to the foundation of Jewish philosophy. So the fact that Rabbi Loew is the key figure in the story of The Golem is highly relevant indeed. He was a living, breathing human being of historical record, one highly esteemed among the Jewish people for more than 500 years.

According to the basic thrust of the legend of The Golem, the Emperor of the Hapsburg Empire had proclaimed that the Jews of Prague were to be expelled or killed—an early "Holocaust," so to speak. The legend varies, but it's clear the emperor had ill will toward the Jews.

In any case, at the time, the Jewish community in Prague was under fire—as many Jewish communities in Europe had been, time and again—because certain Jews were accused of killing Christian children and using their blood in Passover rituals. (The question of whether the

Jews, as a group, or as individuals, or whether factions of Jews actually committed such crimes is a topic of serious debate, as evidenced by a recent scandal in Italy in which an Italian Jewish scholar, Ariel Toaff—based at the Bar-Illan University in Israel, suggested in a book—subsequently withdrawn from circulation for revision after a frenzied response from Jewish organizations—that there is solid historical evidence of such crimes, generally known as "Jewish Ritual Murder."

Whatever the case, at the time, angry Christians in Prague believed the allegations of ritual murder and were waging a campaign of retribution against the Jews. It was Rabbi Loew, according to the legend of The Golem, who found a way to defend the Jewish people.

The rabbi, a skilled practitioner in Jewish mysticism, gathered clay from the River Vitava and created The Golem, a large man-like figure— an early Frankenstein's Monster, more or less—to defend the Jewish community and strike back at the evil Christians.

(There are those who contend that Mary Shelley, the author of Frankenstein, was inspired by the legend of The Golem, when she first crafted her now-famous tale.)

The legend says that Rabbi Loew made the clay image into a living being by placing in his mouth a parchment, known as the "Shem," upon which was inscribed "the life-creating, ineffable Name of God," according to Nathan Ausubel, writing in The Book of Jewish Knowledge.

However, the good Rabbi's creation, Ausubel noted, became "drunk with the immense power he was wielding, menaced the entire Jewish community, even trying to bend the Maharal to his will, which had now turned evil and destructive."

In the end, the rabbi removed the "Shem" from the mouth of The Golem and took away the mad monster's life force.

Yet, the rabbi preserved the body of The Golem and locked the monster away in the attic of Prague's Old-New Synagogue and issued an order barring anyone from visiting there. The tale says that The Golem remains there to this day.

It is claimed that not even the German Gestapo dared to enter the attic of the old synagogue during World War II and that—presumably because of the presence of The Golem—the Old-New Synagogue somehow survived destruction by the Nazis. Or so the legend goes.

Writing at Jewishmag.com, Joyce Ellen Weinstein, provided a concise overview of the legend of "The Golem" noting that the Talmud actually mentions several instances of rabbis creating such man-like creatures and using them to conduct errands. However, in the popular rendition of the Golem legend, as we've seen, the creature ran amok, even turning on his creator. Ms. Weinstein notes:

> The word golem comes from the Hebrew word gelem, meaning raw material. The golem is outwardly a real person, yet he lacks the human dimension of personality and intellect.
>
> Life is interjected into him through a mystical process using God's special name. He is created from the ground, as was the first man. When his mission is over, the name of God is removed from him and he returns to the ground.
>
> Many trace the golem to the mystical teaching of the Kabbalistic book called "Sefer HaYetzera",the book of formation. This ancient book is still in print today and studied by Jewish mystics. The book deals in great length with the actual process of creating the universe.

Essentially, the Golem legend suggests that human beings—in this case, Jewish rabbis—have a power almost equal to that of God: being able to create a living creature that is almost human, but not quite.

And this is significant, from a theological standpoint, in that—quite in contrast to the Christian and Muslim traditions—such power is reserved to God and God alone: It is only God who can create life.

But the Jewish tradition evidently grants superior powers to rabbis, skilled in magic arts that they have used (or perhaps abused or misused, however one defines it) for their own earthly purposes and—in the popular legend of The Golem—Rabbi Loew used supernatural power to bring to life the man-like creature crafted from the natural elements given to man by God, in this instance, the clay of the River Vitava.

So it is that in the Hebrew Bible (see Psalms 139:16) and in the Jewish Talmud, the term galem or gelem—or Golem—refers to an "unformed substance."

The 1971 edition of an Israeli edition of The Encyclopedia Judaica noted the evolving concept that The Golem, as a servant of his creator, "developed dangerous natural powers ... [and that the underlying theme of The Golem] is joined by the new motive of the unrestrained power of the elements which can bring about destruction and havoc."

The very point that The Golem of Jewish folklore was created from the earth as a means by which to defend the Jewish people, only to have The Golem become a force for evil—one that could even redound against his creator and the Jewish people—is a point that bears repeating, and one that calls out to be brought to the attention of the world at large. For today, a very real Golem stands at the brink of bringing the globe to the long-awaited Armageddon.

The legend of The Golem has been told in literature, on the stage and on film. In 1915 Gustav Meyrink commemorated the tale in a Geman-language novel entitled Der Golem, although the latter-day 20th Century Yiddish-language writer, Isaac Bashevis Singer, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, brought more widespread commemoration of the legend in his own short story first published in 1969 in Yiddish, later translated into English.

Beyond question, the best known film production of the tale (one which introduced a visual image of The Golem to the world) came in a three-part silent film series (from 1914 to 1920) by German actor and director Paul Wegener, the best known installment of the series of which is the final film, The Golem: How He Came Into the World, an expressionist drama in which Wegener himself played The Golem. That film was released in the United States in 1921 under the title, The Golem.The image of The Golem, appearing on the cover of this book, is reproduced from Wegener's film. The film is considered a classic, by all estimations.

An often-produced stage production of the tale, also entitled The Golem, was written by a famed Yiddish writer, H. Leivick, and was first introduced in 1924 in Moscow. It's been replayed time and again and in 2002 David Fishelson produced it in New York City through his Manhattan Ensemble Theater.

On April 7, 2002 The New York Times discussed the play in a review entitled, "A Jewish Avenger, a Timely Legend."

Of the Jewish-themed play, the Times noted: "Its central concern is the self-destructive consequences of Jews resorting to violence to defend themselves... The Golem wreaks fierce retribution and the Jews proclaim him a hero. But he gets carried away. He goes on a rampage, spilling the blood of those he was meant to protect."

In 1984, the aforementioned much-beloved Yiddish writer Isaac Bashevis Singer (who, as noted, had previously adapted the story of The Golem) wrote of the legend of the Golem and, quite aptly, compared the Golem to the nuclear arms race: "While we attempt to surpass our enemies and to create new and more destructive golems, the awful possibility is lurking that they may develop a volition of their own, become spiteful, treacherous, mad golems."

Seymour Hersh, the Pulitzer Prize-winning American Jewish journalist, invited controversy by issuing, The Samson Option, his revealing book on Israel's nuclear ambitions, in 1991.

But since then, Israeli journalist Avner Cohen, in his 1999 book, Israel and the Bomb, has not only validated Hersh's earlier work, but provided an even more detailed exposition of the history of Israel's nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

In that volume Cohen wrote of how David Ben-Gurion—the great Israeli (and Jewish) icon, one of Israel's founding fathers and then its prime minister—focused on the development of an atomic bomb and how Ben-Gurion viewed nuclear weapons as being central to Israel's very survival. Ben-Gurion, in fact, was obsessed with the bomb.

Describing Ben-Gurion's obsession with Israeli nuclear supremacy—and of his dissatisfaction with the efforts by President John F. Kennedy to bring an end to Israel's nuclear ambitions—Cohen wrote:

> Imbued with the lessons of the Holocaust, Ben-Gurion was consumed by fears for Israel's security . . .
>
> In his public speeches and writings as prime minister Ben-Gurion rarely discussed the Holocaust. In private conversations and communications with foreign leaders, however, he returned to the lessons of the Holocaust time and again.
>
> In his correspondence with President John F. Kennedy in 1963, he linked Arab enmity to Israel with Hitler's hatred of the Jews, and wrote:
>
> "As a Jew I know the history of my people, and carry with me the memories of all it has endured over a period of three thousand years, and the effort it has cost to accomplish what has been achieved in this country in recent generations . . . Mr. President, my people have the right to exist, both in Israel and wherever they may live, and this existence is in danger" . . .
>
> Anxiety about the Holocaust reached beyond Ben-Gurion to infuse Israeli military thinking. The destruction of Israel defined the ultimate horizon of the threat against Israel. Israeli military planners have always considered a scenario in which a united Arab military coalition launched a war against Israel with the aim of liberating Palestine and destroying the Jewish state.
>
> This was referred to in the early 1950s as mikre hkol, or the "everything scenario." This kind of planning was unique to Israel, as few nations have military contingency plans aimed at preventing apocalypse.
>
> Ben-Gurion had no qualms about Israel's need for weapons of mass destruction . . .Ben-Gurion saw Arab hostility toward Israel as deep and long-lasting ...
>
> Ben-Gurion's pessimism ... influenced Israel's foreign and defense policy for years. Ben-Gurion's world

> view and his decisive governing style shaped his critical role in initiating Israel's nuclear program . . .
>
> Ben-Gurion believed that science and technology had two roles in the realization of Zionism: to advance the State of Israel spiritually and materially, and to provide for a better defense against its external enemies.
>
> Ben-Gurion's determination to launch a nuclear project was the result of strategic intuition and obsessive fears, not of a well-thought-out plan. He believed Israel needed nuclear weapons as insurance if it could no longer compete with the Arabs in an arms race, and as a weapon of last resort in case of an extreme military emergency Nuclear weapons might also persuade the Arabs to accept Israel's existence, leading to peace in the region [he thought].
>
> On 27 June 1963, eleven days after he announced his resignation, Ben-Gurion delivered a farewell address to the employees of the Armaments Development Authority in which, without referring to nuclear weapons, he provided the justification for the nuclear project: "I do not know of any other nation whose neighbors declare that they wish to terminate it, and not only declare, but prepare for it by all means available to them. We must have no illusions that what is declared every day in Cairo, Damascus, Iraq are just words. This is the thought that guides the Arab leaders ... I am confident ... that science is able to provide us with the weapon that will secure the peace, and deter our enemies."

To summarize:The "nuclear option" was not only at the very core of Ben-Gurion's personal world view, but the very foundation of Israel's national security policy. The Israelis were essentially willing, if necessary, to "blow up the world"—including themselves—if they had to do so in order to destroy the Arab neighbors they hate so much.

This policy is better known by what Jewish-American Pulitzer Prize-winning author Seymour Hersh referred to, in the book by the same name, as "The Samson Option"—that, as Samson of the Bible, after being captured by the Philistines, brought down Dagon's Temple in Gaza and killed himself along with his enemies. As Hersh put it: "For Israel's nuclear advocates, the Samson Option became another way of saying 'Never again," (in reference to preventing another Holocaust).

When the late Winston Churchill said that two ancient peoples— the Greeks and the Jews—suffered from a strong impulse of self-destruction, he was not far off the mark.

Most Americans have no idea that the possibility of a full-fledged nuclear "suicide bombing" by the state of Israel itself is a cornerstone of Israel's national security policy

And the frightening fact remains that Jewish (and, in particular, Israeli) attitudes toward non-Jews could play a major role in triggering the activation of Israel's modern-day (and very real) Golem: its nuclear arsenal of weapons of mass destruction..

To understand this danger, we must turn to the fascinating revelations and insights of the late Israeli writer Israel Shahak, a native of Poland who spent a portion of his childhood in the Nazi concentration camp of Dachau, and who emigrated to Palestine in 1945. As years passed, Shahak became an open and very vocal critic of Israeli policies, both foreign and domestic, a valuable source for facts about Israel that few Westerners would dare to address.

While admirers have called Shahak a "prophet," and his critics have called him a "self-hating Jew," there is no doubt that Shahak was an outspoken, articulate and fearless analyst and critic of Israeli foreign policy and Shahak's written works provide a dramatic testament to this.

In his book Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies, Shahak said that—contrary to the general perception—Israel does not seek peace.

It is a myth, he said, that there is any real difference between the supposedly "conflicting" policies being pursued by the "opposing" Likud and Labor blocs whose rivalries have been played out on the global stage and which have overflowed into the American political process, pitting American Likud supporters against Labor backers in America.

Shahak contended that the Israeli lobby in the United States—with all its factions—is ultimately propping up Israel's policy of expansionism with the final aim of consolidating "Eretz Israel"—an imperial state in complete control of practically the entire Middle East.

Shahak dared to point out that Israel's nuclear policies—and the influence of the Israeli lobby on the American political process—are a very real danger in a certain respect that few would dare to imagine. Not only is Israel prepared to destroy itself, but because of its underlying religious and racial bigotry toward non-Jews—the Gentiles—Israel's outlook toward the world at large is driven by a deep-rooted hostility, founded in the religious teachings of Judaism itself.

Shahak's writings in the realm of Israel foreign policy were based almost entirely on public pronouncements in the Hebrew language

press in Israel and, in that realm, Shahak pointed out that what the Israeli government tells its own people about its policies is entirely inconsistent with Israel's insistence to the West and the world at large that Israel "wants peace."

Israel, Shahak contended, is essentially a militarist state and an un-democratic one at that, evidenced by the second-class status accorded its Arab inhabitants and those Christian and Moslem Palestinians in occupied territories. One cannot understand Israel until one understands this vital fact.

The nation's very foundation rests upon its military and defense policies, which, as Shahak made clear, ultimately stem from the fanatic religious tendencies that dictate the thinking of its military and intelligence leaders who are the prime movers behind the engine of state.

Although Israel is quite capable of forging temporary (and often covert) alliances and strategic arrangments even with Arab states—even to the point of dealing with the hated Saddam Hussein when it was in Israel's immediate interest—the bottom line is, quite simply, that—as Shahak demonsrated quite chillingly—Israel will say and do anything to pursue its determined goal of winning total domination at all costs.

If it fails, Israel is perfectly willing to choose "the Samson Option."

The legend of The Golem, first in the tales of the Talmud and later brought forth into popular (or rather Jewish) consciousness in the story of Rabbi Loew of Prague, is a very real warning for our modern world.

The state of Israel mined the earth for uranium in order to produce its atomic "Golem," much as Rabbi Loew took the clay from the River Vitava to produce his own.

And Israel proclaims its Golem as its means to protect Israel from its enemies, real and perceived.

So, now, today in Israel, increasing religious fanaticism, coupled with growing hysteria about purported threats to the nation's survival,raise the very strong possibility that its Golem might be put into force. Israel is determined to prevent other nations of the Middle East from assembling their own nuclear weapons or even having access to peaceful uses for nuclear power.

But like the Golem of Prague, Israel's Golem could produce ugly results that not even the Jewish people might be able to imagine.

And that is why Israel's very real modern day "Golem" is a danger to the world, one that must be dealt with.

Can there be any doubt that the singular and central mission of the modern, civilized world must be to ensure, once and for all, that Israel's nuclear Golem is dismantled, before it's too late?

While there are those who might be inclined to suggest that we are

unfairly targeting "little Israel—the nation that rose from the ashes of the Holocaust, a nation that rightly feels the need to defend itself from yet another Holocaust," the fact is that—as we shall demonstratein the pages that follow—it is the very existence of Israel's Golem that could indeed lead to another Holocaust—a very real Holocaust in the dictionary definition of the word.

The potential of a nuclear catastrophe arising from the problems surrounding The Golem could lead to the absolute destruction of not only the state of Israel but spark a global conflagration that could bring about the end of life on Earth.

At the very least, the existence of Israel's nuclear Golem—and the troubles it has brought to the Middle East and the world at large (particularly because of the iron-clad "special relationship" between the United States and Israel)—could very well ultimately set in motion a worldwide wave of anti-Jewish fervor. Neither Israel nor the Jewish people in diaspora want that.

In such works as Future Fastforward and Brainwashed for War, Programmed to Kill, Malaysian diplomat and attorney Matthias Chang demonstrated that the Zionist global war agenda is operating through a military-industrial-media complex central to the world of warfare that plagues mankind today. And according to Chang, Israel and its intrigues will be the linchpin for forthcoming—and inevitable—nuclear warfare.

Although Chang foresees a "meltdown" of the far-reaching financial forces that drive this war machine, this meltdown will not come without a struggle—and indeed, he says, that struggle has already begun, that we are facing a Long War of the 21st Century.The prospect is not appealing for those who seek peace.

This maelstrom of violence swirls around Israel and its Golem, a direct result of the imposition of the state of Israel upon Palestine in 1948 and the consequences that have come in its wake, particularly as Israel has sought to assert itself—supported by the United States—as a regional power, with the United States waging wars (covert and otherwise) to advance Israel's interests in a variety of realms.

But we must bear in mind that Israel's institutional philosophical and religious outlook toward the rest of the planet is the foundation of the problem we face as a consequence of the existence of The Golem.

As such, in the chapter which follows we will review some of Israeli dissident Israel Shahak's earlier work on the topic of Jewish racism and its attitudes toward "the other."

As we shall see, this institutionalized Jewish racial and religious outlook has significant bearings when one considers the fact that Israel does indeed have its own nuclear Golem.

Chapter One

Israel's Institutional Racism As a Cause for Concern in the Context of its Nuclear Golem

Those who strive to be fair and open-minded toward other faiths, particularly in the discussion of the Middle East conflict, are often heard to proclaim "Zionism is Not Judaism," referring to the fact that there are some Jewish sects that do indeed reject Zionism, and which (at least for now) question the need for the entity we know as Israel.

However, the fact remains that Israel, as now constituted, is a Jewish state, one that has notoriously imposed second-class status on its Arab citizens and carried out Hellish policies against Arabs—Christian and Muslim alike—in the occupied territories. There is a wealth of documentation on this and this point need not here be elaborated upon.

What many people do not realize—even many critics of Israel, if truth be told—is that the reasons for these policies against the Arabs have much more to do with religion and racism than they do with politics. As Dr. Israel Shahak, referenced in the introduction, made clear in his monumental study, Jewish History, Jewish Religion, Israel's deep-rooted racism—and religious fanaticism—has played a major part in its policies toward non-Jews inside Israel and in the occupied lands and its outlook toward the world as a whole.

And because of Israel's willingness to utilize its nuclear "Sampson Option"—effectively blowing up the world in the course of an act of national suicide—the existence of the nuclear Golem is good cause for concern, precisely because of Israel's underlying institutional racism.

Dr. Shahak's Jewish History, Jewish Religion is an eye-opening study of the teachings of Jewish Orthodoxy, examining how that little-understood persuasion—very powerful, in its original form, in Israel today (and not only among the Orthodox Jews)—impacts upon both Israeli domestic and foreign policy and upon the Israeli view view of non-Jewish peoples worldwide.

Although the American mass media is rife with horror stories of purported Muslim hostility to Christians and Jews alike, the fact—as documented by Israel Shahak—of Jewish religious and racial hostility to all non-Jews is never discussed. Repeat: it is never discussed.

A most uncomfortable work for Christians—who would like to believe that Orthodox Judiasm is some sort of friendly grand-uncle to the Christian faith and for Jews who would have Americans, in particular, believe that Israel is some exotic modern-day Biblical manifestation and a model for the civilized world to pattern itself upon—Dr. Shahak's Jewish History, Jewish Religion established the Israeli dissident in the

minds of free-thinkers as a forthright expositor of the historical circumstances—and of the religious and philosophical mindset—that together guide Israel and its ruling elite today. In that volume, Shahak wrote:

> A Jewish state, whether based on its present Jewish ideology or, if it becomes even more Jewish in character than it is now, on the principles of Jewish Orthodoxy, cannot ever contain an open society.
>
> There are two choices which face Israeli-Jewish society. It can become a fully closed and warlike ghetto, a Jewish Sparta, supported by the labor of Arab helots, kept in existence by its influence on the U.S. political establishment and by threats to use its nuclear powers, or it can try to become an open society.
>
> The second choice is dependent on an honest examination of its Jewish past, on the admission that Jewish chauvinism and exclusivism exist, and on an honest examination of the attitudes of Judaism toward the non-Jews.

Shahak candidly described the nature of the hostility toward non-Jews that is found in Jewish religious teachings:

> It must be admitted at the outset that the Talmud and the Talmudic literature—quite apart from the general anti-Gentile streak that runs through them ... contain very offensive statements and precepts directed specifically against Christianity.
>
> For example, in addition to a series of scurrilous sexual allegations against Jesus, the Talmud states that his punishment in hell is to be immersed in boiling excrement—a statement not exactly calculated to endear the Talmud to devout Christians. Or one can quote the precept according to which Jews are instructed to burn, publicly if possible, any copy of the New Testament that comes into their hands.
>
> (This is not only still in force but actually practiced today; thus on 23 March 1980 hundreds of copies of the New Testament were publicly and ceremonially burnt in Jerusalem under the auspices of Yad Le'akhim, a Jewish religious organization subsidized by the Israeli Ministry of Religions.)

Commenting upon the fact that many Christian people in the West had discovered the virulent anti-Christian teachings in the Talmud, Shahak described how Jewish leaders sought to "revise" the Talmud in order that future Christians who sought to study the Talmud would effectively be fooled by such revisions:

> Talmudic passages directed against Christianity or against non-Jews had to go or to be modified—the pressure was too strong.
>
> This is what was done: a few of the most offensive passages were bodily removed from all editions printed in Europe after the mid-16th century.
>
> In all other passages, the expressions "Gentile," "non-Jew," "stranger" (gay, eino yehudi, nokhri)—which appear in all early manuscripts and printings as well as in all editions published in Islamic countries-were replaced by terms such as "idolator," "heathen" or even "Canaanite" or "Samaritan," terms which could be explained away but which a Jewish reader could recognize as euphemisms for the old expressions.

However, in Czarist Russia, Shahak noted, the newly-inserted euphemisms for non-Jews were recognized immediately for precisely what they were. As such, Talmudic scholars made further revisions:

> Thereupon the rabbinical authorities substituted the terms "Arab" or "Muslim" (in Hebrew, Yishma'eli—which means both) or occasionally "Egyptian," correctly calculating that the Tsarist authorities would not object to this kind of abuse.

Yet, for the consumption of the Jews themselves, Shahak pointed out, the Talmudic scholars provided guidelines so that students of the Talmud (and Jews in general) could understand the new "code" words:

> At the same time, lists of Talmudic Omissions were circulated in manuscript form, which explained all the new terms and pointed out all the omissions. At times, a general disclaimer was printed before the title page of each volume of talmudic literature, solemnly declaring, sometimes on oath, that all hostile expressions in that volume are intended only against the idolators of

> antiquity, or even against the long-vanished Canaanites, rather than against "the peoples in whose land we live."
>
> After the British conquest of India, some rabbis hit on the subterfuge of claiming that any particularly outrageous derogatory expression used by them is only intended against the Indian. Occasionally the aborigines of Australia were also added as whipping boys.
>
> Needless to say, all this was a calculated lie from beginning to end; and following the establishment of the State of Israel, once the rabbis felt secure, all the offensive passages and expressions were restored without hesitation in all new editions.

Shahak wrote of the great Jewish scholar Moses Maimonides whose Guide to the Perplexed is, as Shahak noted, "justly considered to be the greatest work of Jewish religious philosophy and is widely read and used even today."

In fact, as Shahak revealed, Maimonides was intensely racist, in the classic modern-day sense of the word: that is, the iconic Jewish figure, a major authority on the Talmud, was, as Shahak put it: "an anti-Black racist." Shahak wrote:

> Towards the end of the Guide, in a crucial chapter (book III, chapter 51) he discusses how various sections of humanity can attain the supreme religious value, the true worship of God. Among those who are incapable of even approaching this are: "Some of the Turks [i.e. the Mongol race] and the nomads in the north, and the Blacks and the nomads in the south, and those who resemble them in our climates. And their nature is like the nature of mute animals, and according to my opinion, they are not on the level of human beings, and their level among existing things is below that of a man and above that of a monkey, because they have the image and the resemblance of a man more than a monkey does."

Noting this, Shahak asks: "Now, what does one do with such a passage in a most important and necessary work of Judaism? Face the truth and its consequences? God forbid! Admit (as so many Christian scholars, for example, have done in similar circumstances) that a very important Jewish authority held also rabid anti-Black views, and by this admission

make an attempt at self-education in real humanity? Perish the thought." Commenting on the inflammatory nature of these writings from the pen of an esteemed Talmudic scholar, Shahak added:

> I can almost imagine Jewish scholars in the USA consulting among themselves, 'What is to be done?'— for the book had to be translated, due to the decline in the knowledge of Hebrew among American Jews. Whether by consultation or by individual inspiration, a happy "solution" was found: in the popular American translation of the Guide by one Friedlander, first published as far back as 1925 and since then reprinted in many editions, including several in paperback, the Hebrew word Kushim, which means Blacks, was simply transliterated and appears as "Kushites," a word which means nothing to those who have no knowledge of Hebrew, or to whom an obliging rabbi will not give an oral explanation.

Shahak also noted the irony, as he put it, that "There is yet another misconception about Judaism which is particularly common among Christians or people heavily influenced by Christian tradition and culture. This is the misleading idea that Judaism is a 'biblical religion'; that the Old Testament has in Judaism the same central place and legal authority which the Bible has for Protestant or even Catholic Christianity."

Nothing, he said, could be further from the truth, and this, he understood, would come as a great surprise to many Christians who have lent their support to Israel, believing Judaism (and Israel) to have risen from the same principles of the Christian faith predominant in America today.

Shahak underscored the nature of Talmudic teachings vis-a-vis non-Jews, pointing out that the Talmud declares: "A Jew who murders a Gentile is guilty only of a sin against the laws of Heaven, not punishable by a court.To cause indirectly the death of a Gentile is no sin at all."

Should anyone doubt this is the philosophy of Israel, as a state, Shahak pointed out that the chief chaplain of the Central Region Command of the Israeli Army wrote in a religious booklet for distribution to Israeli soldiers that:

> When our forces come across civilians during a war or in hot pursuit or in a raid, so long as there is no certainty that those civilians are incapable of harming

> our forces, then according to the Halakhah they may and even should be killed ... Under no circumstances should an Arab be trusted, even if he makes an impression of being civilized.
>
> In war, when our forces storm the enemy, they are allowed and even enjoined by the Halakhah to kill even good civilians, that is, civilians who are ostensibly good. [Emphasis added.]

(The Halakha—referenced above—is the legal system of classical Judaism, based primarily on the Babylonian Talmud, and is maintained to this day in the form of Orthodox Judaism which is a powerful force in Israel. The earliest code of Talmudic law is the MishnehTorah, written by the aforementioned Moses Maimonides in the late 12th century.)

Shahak noted that classical Jewish teaching links Satan with non-Jews and that Jewish women were warned to beware meeting any of these Satanic creatures: "Gentile, pig, dog or monkey."

If meeting such a creature after taking her monthly ritual bath of purification, a Jewish woman is told she must bathe again. This warning appeared in Shevat Musar—a book on Jewish moral conduct—that, Shahak noted is "still widely read in some Orthodox circles." In contrast, Jewish teachings regarding non-Jewish women is quite different:

> Every Gentile woman is regarded as N.Sh.G.Z.—acronym for the Hebrew words niddah, shifhah, goyab, zonah (unpurified from menses, slave, Gentile, prostitute). Upon conversion to Judaism, she ceases indeed to be niddah, shifhah, goyah but is still consider zonah (prostitute) for the rest of her life, simply by virtue of having been born of a Gentile mother.

In light of all of this—and much more—Shahak recognized that organized Jewish groups and Jewish leaders, particularly in the United States and the West, understand—as they should—that non-Jews might find offense in such teachings and that "Under present circumstances they cannot openly express these attitudes toward non-Jews in the USA where non-Jews constitute more than 97 percent of the population."

Shahak said Jews (and Israelis) must recognize the underlying racism of their ethnic and Israeli national psyche:"Although the struggle against antisemitism (and of all other forms of racisim) should never cease, the struggle against Jewish chauvinism and exclusivism, which must include a critique of classical Judaism, is now of equal or greater

importance . . . Without fear or favor, we must speak out against what belongs to our own past

There have been many informative critiques of Israel's foreign policy gyrations and manipulations written from a variety of perspectives, including quite a few worthy dissections of the dangers posed to U.S. policy by the ongoing and imbalanced American support for "Israel Uber Alles,"but Shahak's work will stand as a decisive analysis of what Israel's real aims and motivations are really all about.

Dr. Shahak's candid discussion of Jewish religious teachings are frightening indeed, especially when one considers the power of Israel over United States policy making today. Then, when pondering how that religious ideology impacts upon Israel's geopolitical strategy—particularly as it is based upon that nation's pivotal arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction—the entire picture is one that points toward a possible future for the world too horrible to imagine.

Chapter Two

The Rise of Fanaticism in the Israeli Political Arena and its Implications for Israel's Nuclear Golem: Will Avigdor Lieberman be the Architect of Armageddon?

In light of the warnings of Dr. Israel Shahak—warnings that have largely gone unheard and, when heard, unheeded—the growing rise of hard-line religious and political ideologues in Israel (a phenomenon that is little understood outside the ranks of those who make the study of Israel's affairs their responsibility), the fact of Israel's nuclear Golem becames all the more critical.

The perfect case study of the rise of Israel's so-called "Radical Right" can be found in the instance of Avigdor Lieberman Most Americans (indeed most people on the face of the planet) have never heard of Avigdor Lieberman, but they need to know precisely who this dangerous and influential demagogue is. At this critical stage, he is the Israeli official who defines Israel's war-mongering policy toward Iran.

As a high-level Israeli power broker, Lieberman may well be the one individual who has the very real capacity to spark the next world war. He is the Zionist state's chief tactician in the ongoing effort by Israel and its American lobby to force mothers and fathers in the United States to dispatch their sons and daughters into a war against Israel's perceived number one enemy: the Islamic Republic of Iran.

A veteran Israeli hate-monger, known for his angry racist rhetoric aimed at Christian Arabs and their Muslim brothers, Lieberman has been a fixture in Israeli politics for more than 20 years, in spite of—or perhaps because of—his alleged ties to Russian-based Jewish organized crime elements who maintain Israeli citizenship.

The rising popularity and political influence of Lieberman, Israel's new deputy prime minister, and its first-ever cabinet-level "minister for strategic affairs," is not just a reflection of what some call "Israel's dark side," but rather, instead, represents the reality of opinion amongst a large segment of the population in Israel today.

A so-called "hard-liner" and "right winger," Lieberman has been referred to as "the Israeli Hitler," and, in fact, his views do reflect a form of "Jewish Fascism," a striking mirror image of the so-called "Islamic Fascism" about which we hear so much in the pro-Israel controlled media in America today.

Lieberman is the key contact in Israel that Israel's well-heeled advocates in the United States are in liaison with in the carefully orchestrated push for the Bush administration, with the support of its ostensible "critics" in Congress, to attack Iran, even using nuclear weapons.

Through his influential positioning, Lieberman is coordinating Israel's American-based lobbying and propaganda groups—such as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, among others—in working to push America into more wars in the Middle East.

Lieberman remains highly regarded among not only his Israeli followers, but among American partisans of Israel, who have no reservations about this no-holds-barred bigot. His harsh rhetoric against Christian Palestinians and their Muslim brothers recalls the venomous outbursts of a former Israeli cabinet minister, Rehavam Ze-evi who once called Christians and Muslims "lice" and said they were like a "cancer" destroying the Jewish state.

Arising from the traditional "Greater Israel" school of thought, Lieberman dreams of the day when the Jewish state stretches from "the Nile to the Euphrates." In other words, Israel's borders will reach from inside the current borders of Egypt and eastward, to assume command of all of not only Lebanon, Syria and Jordan but also substantial portions of Iraq and Saudi Arabia.

The ongoing U.S. occupation of Iraq, following the U.S. offensive against that secular Arab republic—largely stimulated by pressure from the Israeli lobby in Washington—is perceived today by many in the Arab world (and in the Muslim world generally) to be a partial step toward fulfillment of the dream of Greater Israel. The destruction of Iran, followed by a U.S. occupation, would simply be another additional land grab on behalf of Israel's geopolitical ambitions.

Observers from all points of view on the political spectrum assert that Lieberman's alliance with the government of Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, leader of the Kadima Party, has strengthened Lieberman and his own Yisrael Beiteinu Party. Although the English translation of the party's name—"Israel is Our Home"—sounds quaint and cozy, Lieberman's party calls for what is no less than the "ethnic cleansing" of the Christians and Muslims living in Israel.

Growing numbers of Lieberman's countrymen hail him for his raucous demands that Christian Arabs and Muslim Arabs living inside Israel or under Israeli control be "transferred." In truth, what Lieberman and his followers are advocating is genocide, pure and simple, precisely as defined by the international Genocide Convention. Genocide isn't just murder, under the terms of the global convention. It also includes the forced transfer of ethnic populations.

So while Lieberman and his co-religionists in Israel and around the globe are constantly bewailing past genocidal policies against Jewish

people, both real and imaginary, Lieberman has emerged as a much-beloved voice for many Israelis who want genocide to be practiced against the Muslim and Christian Arabs of the Holy Land.

Although there are those in both Israel and the United States who put forth the theme that Lieberman is some sort of political aberration— that he represents a loud and fanatic but relatively small body of opinion in Israel—there are informed analysts who don't buy that theory.

Instead, they say, Lieberman is simply bellowing loudly and without hesitation what many people in Israel and its satellite,America, are thinking, protests to the contrary notwithstanding.

That the likes of Lieberman could one day be in charge of Israel's Nuclear Golem is good reason alone for the world to take a very close look at the need for dismantling Israel's arsenal of weapons of mass destruction.

But there's more ...

Chapter Three

A Civil War in Israel?
Could Fanatic Jewish Extremists
Gain Control of Israel's Nuclear Golem?

At least two respected American publications known as leading voices in support of Israel have highlighted open speculation in recent times that civil war could be looming in Israel.

Yet, this news—which is commonly reported in the European press and freely discussed in Israel and in American Jewish newspapers—is a deep, dark secret to many Americans who rely on the American media monopoly for their news and information.

These very legitimate concerns could provide a stimulus for global demands that prompt action be taken to dismantle Israel's controversial—and officially "non-existent"—cache of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, its Golem.

Should a civil war tear Israel asunder, extremist elements in Israel— of which there are many, including even in the military and intelligence elite—could seize control of Israel's nuclear arsenal and this could spell a very real danger of nuclear war.

The fear that nuclear weapons—anywhere—could come into the hands of extremists has always been a cornerstone of global efforts to control nuclear proliferation.

As such the concerns about Israel's political divisions, being expressed even by supporters of Israel, raise a very frightening specter about what potentially could happen and why dismantling Israel's nuclear arsenal is more pressing than ever before.

In the Sept. 27, 2004 issue of the pro-Israel journal, The New Republic (TNR), widely respected American Jewish writer Leon Wieseltier—whose "Washington Diarist" column in TNR is considered "must" reading in some circles—raised the specter of a civil war in Israel. "Israel's Coming War Within" is how TNR boosted Wieseltier's frightening column.

Citing translations from the September 10, 2004 issue of the Hebrew-language version of the Israeli newspaper, Ha 'aretz, Wieseltier described how prominent figures of Israel's hard-line conservative movement had called on members of the Israeli Army to resist any orders to participate in the expulsion or removal of Jewish settlers in the Gaza strip, historically Egyptian territory seized by Israel in the June 1967 war and occupied by Israel until its recent "withdrawal."

Wieseltier pointed out that even tough-talking Israeli leader Ariel Sharon, who had laid forth plans for the orderly withdrawal of Jewish

settlers from Gaza—much to the anger and shock of his own longtime supporters—was now being called a "dictator" and was being "menaced by what Wieseltier described as Kabbalistic curses and extremist plots."

In Wieseltier's judgment—which is fairly well-regarded among supporters of Israel—the domestic opposition to Sharon in Israel was so intense, the hatred so deeply felt, that "you would think that Ariel Sharon were Hadrian, or Ferdinand, or the Czar," referring to three historic rulers who expelled Jewish people from their lands. Wieseltier cited the rhetoric of Sharon's critics who said that Sharon's orders are "a crime against the nation and a crime against humanity, an expression of cruelty, wickedness, and imperiousness." All of this, said Wieseltier, are "grounds for dread."

In virtual echo of Wieseltier, Rabbi Sholom Riskin—a Sharon critic-wrote a column published in the Oct. 1, 2004 issue of Forward, one of the most influential Jewish community newspapers in America. Riskin— who is the rabbi of one of the largest Jewish settlements in controversy—is actually considered one of the more "moderate" voices among the settlers, and yet in his opinion,"the specter of disengagement from Gaza, and the concomitant uprooting of its residents, threatens the very fabric of the Jewish state." Riskin wrote:

> Extremist statements about treachery of political leaders and suggestions of refusal to carry out orders of evacuation are being heard from the right, while the entire settler community is being pictured as civil war mongers and spoilers of peace by the left.

Riskin concluded his assessment of the precarious situation in Israel by asserting: "As tragic as it sounds, it is difficult to rule out the possibility of a looming civil war."

As regular readers of the foreign press are well aware, Sharon himself often accused his critics of inciting civil war, even as there had been open discussion of the possibility of a split within the Israeli Army itself.

At one point, many active-duty Israeli officers and soldiers expressed concerns about following Sharon's orders and suggested that they would rebel against the civilian leadership if directed to uproot Jewish settlers in Gaza.

Any careful study of the details of the situation would demonstrate, many of these Israelis in question are under the discipline of leaders who are as extreme as some infamous Muslim leaders who are constantly highlighted in the American media which prefers to ignore the existence of the extremist Jewish leaders in Israel (and elsewhere).

And before one is inclined to dismiss concerns about the dangers of Israeli nuclear weapons falling into the hands of Jewish extremists, it should be noted that there has been open speculation, in American defense circles, about the potential dangers relating to Israel's nuclear arsenal that might arise from political instability in Israel.

Americans who value the strategic thinking of their own military leaders would do well to heed the commentary regarding Israel's nuclear weapons by U.S. Army Lt. Colonel Warner D. Farr who filed a special briefing on that "controversial" topic with the U.S. Air Force Counterproliferation Center at the Air War College-Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama in September of 1999.

Since the center was established, in its own words,"to provide information and analysis to U.S. national security policy-makers and USAF officers to assist them in countering the threat posed by adversaries equipped with weapons of mass destruction," it is noteworthy that Farr's paper is quite candid vis-a-vis Israel.

In its no-holds-barred assessment of the situation in Israel. Entitled "The Third Temple's Holy of Holies: Israel's Nuclear Weapons," Colonel Farr's paper noted:

> Another speculative area concerns Israeli nuclear security and possible misuse. What is the chain of decision and control of Israel's weapons? How susceptible are they to misuse or theft?
>
> With no open, frank, public debate on nuclear issues, there has accordingly been no debate or information on existing safeguards. This has led to accusations of "monolithic views and sinister intentions."
>
> Would a right wing military government decide to employ nuclear weapons recklessly?
>
> Ariel Sharon, an outspoken proponent of "Greater Israel" was quoted as saying, "Arabs may have the oil, but we have the matches." Could the Gush Emunim, a right wing religious organization, or others, hijack a nuclear device to "liberate" the Temple Mount for the building of the third temple? Chances are small but could increase as radicals decry the peace process.
>
> A 1997 article reviewing the Israeli Defense Force repeatedly stressed the possibilities of, and the need to guard against, a religious, right wing military coup, especially as the proportion of religious [fanaticism] in the military increases.

So although concerns about the immediate possibility of an Israeli civil war seem to have alleviated, at least for the moment, serious conflict still remains within Israeli socieety. Thus, the warnings from Lt. Colonel Farr do bear keeping in mind.

One recent volume exploring Israel's domestic turmoil—essentially "Jew vs. Jew" to put it bluntly—is Noah Efron's candid work, Real Jews: Secular vs. Ultra-Orthodox and the Struggle for Jewish Identity in Israel. Efron—who teaches at Bar-Ilan University near Tel Aviv—has documented the amazing (and little-known, outside Jewish circles) troubles that are tearing Israel asunder. The book describes "a country at war with itself... a country in disrepair, facing war, terror, corruption, poverty and decay." All of this hardly the image of Israel in the minds of Israel's American Christian devotees! In addition, Efron's work notes, the hardline Orthodox elements have been "tipping the balance between left and right, giving them disproportionately great political power."

Clearly, things are not so peaceful within Israel's Jewish circles as the average American might believe. And as the publisher of Efron's work has said, "this conflict can longer be ignored."

Israel is indeed a powderkeg with political power up for grabs— and one where its Golem is the ultimate prize.

And although Ariel Sharon is no longer on the scene, having been felled by a stroke, the presence of Avigdor Lieberman in the Israeli government itself—not to mention continuing stress among the varying factions within Israel—still point toward a potential danger of a civil war in Israel some day in the future, a danger that cannot be dismissed in light of the existence of Israel's nuclear Golem.

A civil war in Israel could—if only temporarily—put the control of Israel's nuclear weapons at the disposal of Israeli extremists whose very last concern is what the United States—or the world—would think.

These extremists believe they are acting out the will of God. And therefore, the world should stand warned.

However, despite all of the concerns about the fanatic hard-liners getting control of nuclear weapons in Israel, the truth is—as history shows—Israel was on the verge of "going nuclear" in the not-to-distant past. It is not just Israel's "extremists" who are a danger as far as utilizing Israel's nuclear Golem is concerned.

Chapter Four

Not Just the "Fanatics" . . . Israel's Mainstream Leaders and the Threat of The Golem

Thus far, in this our study of Israel's nuclear Golem, we have largely focused on the threat of religious fanaticism in Israel vis-a-vis its possible impact on Israel's nuclear weapons policy.

However, we would be remiss in leading the reader to believe that only Israel's more fanatic elements would be inclined toward using Israel's nuclear arsenal.

As we noted, early on, it must always be kept in mind that Israel's nuclear weapons policy is at the very center of the nation's geopolitical and military strategy. It is a foundational part of the nation's being.

Assembly of a nuclear arsenal—long since achieved—was a foremost goal of Israel's founding father, David Ben-Gurion, and all subsequent Israeli leaders have relied on Israel's nuclear policies as a centerpiece of their foreign policy.

In any case, the historical record shows that even "mainstream" Israeli leaders—including David Ben-Gurion himself—were very much inclined toward heavy-handed imperial thinking hardly any different from that of some modern-day Israeli hard-liners of the likes of Avigdor Lieberman, whom we examined in an earlier chapter.

And as we pointed out, Lieberman, for his own part, becomes increasingly more "mainstream" by the day. Lieberman, in some respects, is only echoing publicly what Ben-Gurion said privately. Despite the heated denials that Israeli leaders still cling to the dream of a "Greater Israel" stretching "From the Nile to the Euphrates," the fact is that this unifinished dream remains one that is still very much in force in mainstream Zionist thinking.

What's more, although defenders of Israel claim that the Jewish state has no record of attacking other nations, their claims are belied by a wide-ranging array of data assembled by a variety of writers (coming from a variety of perspectives) who contend that Israel, in fact, could correctly be cited as the actual instigators of more than one of the Arab-Israeli wars fought since the establishment of Israel in 1948.

In addition, it must be recalled, in particular, that Israel—along with France and Great Britain—was instrumental in the offensive against Egypt during the Suez Crisis. So Israel is hardly blameless in regard to wars of aggression. Those who say otherwise are dissembling.

And it was during the Suez affair that then-Prime Minister Ben-Gurion frankly talked of Israel's imperial ambitions, its dream of expanding its geographical borders beyond those established in 1948.

For more on this, we turn to the work of U.S. Army Lt. Col. Warner

Farr. In his previously cited briefing paper, "The Third Temple's Holy of Holies: Israel's Nuclear Weapons." Farr wrote:

> In a tete-a-tete with [French Prime Minister Guy] Mollet, Ben-Gurion said he aimed to take control of all Sinai and to annex it to Israel, in order to exploit the oil, which he said was to be found there. At the meeting with the French delegation that opened the Sevres conference, Ben-Gurion expounded upon his vision for a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, based on the following principles:
>
> Internationalization of the Suez Canal, disbanding the Kingdom of Jordan and dividing it between Iraq and Israel, British patronage over Iraq and the Arabian peninsula, and French patronage over Syria and Lebanon (where Christian rule would be assured).
>
> The French listened to the plan politely and [Israeli general Moshe] Dayan wrote in his diary that the plan "might be seen as fantastic, even naive."
>
> Ben-Gurion would occasionally let himself get carried away with his visionary ideas when meeting with world leaders.

Although Ben-Gurion's colleague, General Dayan, might refer to the Israeli founding father's imperial ambitions as being "visionary," Israel's Arab neighbors—not to mention most of the rest of the world—might consider those ambitions something else entirely: a threat.

In fact, on November 6, 1956—at the height of the Suez campaign—Ben-Gurion gave a speech announcing the formation of "The Third Kingdom of Israel," referring, in fact, to that dream of "Greater israel" which—at that juncture—Ben-Gurion clearly believed was a very real possibility since little Israel was allied with the European powers of Britain and France against Egypt. It was only the intervention of American President Dwight D. Eisenhower that prevented the dream from becoming a reality.

The so-called "Third Kingdom" was (and is) indeed the philosophical foundation of the worldview of the fanatics in Israel. Yet, it was Ben-Gurion—who publicly portrayed himself the world as a secular force in Israeli affairs—who was adopting this imperial rhetoric.

And while Ben-Gurion's defenders in years since have suggested that the tensions of the conflict at Suez—coupled with a bout with influenza that afflicted Ben-Gurion at the time—caused what Lt. Col.

Farr correctly referred to as Ben-Gurion's "bizarre messianic outbreak," the fact remains that Israel's leader was indeed talking in these potentially apocolyptic terms. So even "mainstream" Israeli leaders such as the vaunted Ben-Gurion have shown their capacity—for whatever reasons—to lean in dangerous directions.

But Israel did not have a nuclear arsenal in 1956. However—by all estimations—Israel did have a nuclear arsenal by the time of the so-called "Six Day War" in 1967 and Farr pointed out in his study that Israel, in fact, went on nuclear alert during that war, prepared to use its Golem to vanquish its Arab enemies. And that was just the first time.

In October of 1973, when Israel was fighting the Yom Kippur War against Egypt and Syria, Israel's front lines were crumbling, and, according to Farr, citing Time magazine, Israeli General Moshe Dayan, then defense minister, told Prime Minister Golda Meir that "this is the end of the Third Temple." In other words, the end of the state of Israel, in Dayan's judgment, was near.

And it was not for nothing that the word "temple"—Farr pointed out—was also the code word for nuclear weapons.

Thus, as Israel prepared for nuclear strikes against Egyptian and Syrian targets and word of the plan was leaked to the United States through Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—perhaps Israel's leading advocate inside the administration of President Richard Nixon—and the United States (under the pressure of Israel's threat to use nuclear firepower) began opening up a line of supply to the Israeli forces.

However, even before the United States support had come through the lines, the Israelis were able to counterattack and drive their Arab enemies into submission. And as Warner Farr pointed out: "Thus started the subtle, opaque use of the Israeli bomb to ensure that the United States kept its pledge to maintain Israel's conventional weapons edge over its foes."

So the historical record demonstrates that—at least twice—the Israelis (under so-called "mainstream" leadership) moved toward nuclear Armageddon, putting their Golem on ready, prepared to go full force in the first war-time use of atomic weapons since 1945.

Israel's nuclear Golem—in the hands of any Israeli government— has already been unveiled. It is not "just the fanatics" who might be tempted to use the Zionist Golem. Israel is a nation—its national security strategy founded on the concept of "national suicide if necessary" to defeat its enemies—that has a proven history of nuclear provocation. The next time there may be no way of stopping it.

Israel is a friend to no nation except itself, as we shall further in the chapter which follows.

Chapter Five

Yes, Israel Will Attack First. . .
And Attack an "Ally" as Well.
The Assault on the Liberty and
the Israeli Nuclear Connection.

The state of Israel has demonstrated that, for its own ends, it has no hesitation in attacking its erstwhile "friends," just as much as it is willing to attack its enemies.

In fact, there is evidence to believe that Israel's dliberate and unprovoked attack on the American spy ship, the U.S.S. Liberty on June 8, 1967 may have been, at least in part, because of Israel's fear that the Liberty may have been surveilling Israel's top-secret nuclear weapons program.

Although the debate surrounding the reasons for the attack continues to rage, a capsule overview of the shocking circumstances surrounding the murder of 34 Americans by the armed forces of Israel in this terrorist attack that few Americans know about demonstrates precisely the dangerous nature of the Zionist state, one that is now armed with a massive arsenal of nuclear weapons.

While defenders of Israel (particularly American politicians who are "on the take" from the well-heeled Jewish lobby in Washington—continue to insist that the attack on the Liberty was a grievous "mistake," the survivors of the Liberty say otherwise, and the circumstances of the attack make it all too clear that the attack was indeed deliberate and that the Israelis knew well that it was an American vessel that they were seeking to destroy.

Although President George W. Bush has loudly and repeatedly called upon the American people to "Support the Troops," those survivors of the Liberty remain the only known American troops whom President Bush and American politicians of both major political parties refuse to support. And that says much about the state of affairs in America today.

The attack upon the Liberty—sailing peacefully in the Mediterranean—took place in the middle of a sunny afternoon. The American flag aboard the Liberty flapped clearly in the breeze. Three unmarked Israeli aircraft, accompanied by three torpedo boats, conducted the brutal assault.

The attack began with rockets and then continued with napalm, a burning chemical that clings to human skin with grisly results. Then the torpedo boats raked the decks of the Liberty with machine-gun fire as the American sailors tried to extinguish the fires started by the napalm. The Liberty was then torpedoed not once, but three times, but, miraculously, did not sink. Thirty-four Americans died in the incident and 171 others were injured.

When news of the attack reached the White House, President Lyndon Johnson alerted the commander of the Sixth Fleet to prepare for retaliatory action, assuming the Egyptians were responsible. Later, when learning the Israelis were responsible, he called off the alert.

Very little about the tragedy was mentioned in the American press. What reports there were indicated it was a "tragic mistake." In addition, media accounts underestimated the number of the dead.

Then, under the direction of Admiral John S. McCain, commander in chief of the U.S. Naval Forces in Europe, a court of inquiry was conducted by Rear Admiral I. C. Kidd. McCain and Kidd knew better, but they still announced that the attack was "a case of mistaken identity."

(McCain's cover up for Israel's slaughter of American Navy boys forged a unique tie between the McCain family and Israel, such that, today, McCain's son, John, the Republican senator from Arizona, is one of Israel's favorite Republicans.)

The Liberty survivors were told to "shut up." Anyone who talked was threatened with court-martial."If anyone asks," the sailors were told, "tell them it was an accident." The survivors were dispersed worldwide so that no two men were sent to the same place.

The incident was mentioned in passing in a variety of media— buried, for example, on a back page in The New York Times immediately after the horrific event—but the first time that the whole shocking story was told on a national scale was in The Spotlight on April 26, 1976.

However—as early as within one month after the tragedy on July 15, 1967—The Washington Observer newsletter, published by Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist institution, told readers the Israeli attack on the American vessel was indeed deliberate.

There is no question the Israelis not only intended to sink the Liberty but also to kill the entire crew so that no living witnesses could emerge to point the finger at the Israelis.The Israelis hoped to blame the Arabs for the crime—a long-standing "false flag" technique used by Israel in its numerous acts of terrorism.

Defenders of Israel demand to know why the Israelis would desire the total destruction of the Liberty and the mass murder of all aboard. Why would Israel attack an ally? The answer is disturbing, and that's putting it lightly.

A Spotlight report of Nov. 21, 1977 implicated the CIA's counterintelligence chief, James J. Angleton, in having conspired with Israel in orchestrating the attack on the Liberty with the intent that the attack would be blamed on the Arabs.

An Israeli loyalist who headed the CIA's liaison with Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, and who also played a key role in helping

Israel develop its nuclear arsenal (in defiance of President John F. Kennedy), Angleton believed the destruction of the Liberty could be used as a "Pearl Harbor" or "Remember the Maine" type incident to inflame American passions against the Arabs.

And that's what the Liberty incident was really all about. Only because the Liberty did not sink, despite the dirtiest efforts by the Israelis to destroy the vessel and all aboard, was the scheme derailed. The American sailors lived to tell the truth: that it was Israel that attacked their ship—not the Arabs.

British journalist Peter Hounam's shocking documentary, U.S.S. Liberty: Dead in the Water, confirmed The Spotlight's report, indicating the attack on the Liberty nearly resulted in a full-fledged nuclear attack by the United States on Cairo, the Egyptian capital.

And these are facts that Israel and its defenders want suppressed.

In 1983 a top secret report prepared in 1967 by the legal advisor to the U.S. secretary of state, was released (without fanfare) for the first time. The report assessed claims by Israel that the attack was a mistake. The report demonstrated Israel's claims to be lies. For example:

• The Israelis claimed that the Liberty was traveling at a high (and therefore suspicious) speed of 28 to 30 knots. In fact, the ship was drifting along at only five knots.

• The Israelis claimed that the Liberty refused to identify itself. In fact, the only signals from the Israeli torpedo boats came after the torpedo attack had already been launched, with the result that 25 sailors had already died when the Liberty was hit by an Israeli torpedo.

• The Israelis claimed that the Liberty did not fly an American flag or carry identifying insignia. In fact, not only did the Liberty have a U.S. flag flying in the wind, but after that flag was shot down, another and much larger flag was hoisted by the American sailors when they realized they were under attack by ostensibly "friendly" forces from "our ally, Israel." In addition, the Liberty's name and identification numbers were clearly displayed on the hull which had just recently been painted.

According to Liberty survivors, the Israeli aircraft had actually circled the ship no less than 13 times for several hours before the attack commenced. Some of the Liberty sailors even waved to the "friendly" Israelis from the decks of the ship, not knowing that they were targeted for annihilation shortly thereafter.

What follows are just a handful of comments by American survivors of the Israeli attack on the Liberty. Their views represent the thinking of many, many other survivors. Could this many American servicemen be "mistaken" or otherwise "lying"—as advocates of Israel contend—about Israel's culpability in the tragic Liberty affair?

• Ernie Gallo: "The day before I was topside when Israeli planes came by and very close where we could wave to the pilots and they were that close where we could wave back."

• Rick Aimetti:"lt was a very clear day It was a warm day, the sunshine was shining brightly, a nice breeze blowing and I distinctly remember hearing the [American] flag flapping in the wind."

• Phil Tourney: "There was approximately thirteen sorties of our ship [by Israeli planes] from six o'clock until 12 o'clock in the afternoon. We had a general quarters drill that lasted forty-five minutes or so."

• Stan White: "I stepped out on deck and a plane came by and I looked right in the cockpit. He waved. I waved.That's how close they were.They knew who we were.:

• George Golden:"Of all the recon flights that they had that morning, overlooking our ship for six to seven hours. They had a good idea of what they were doing and they hit us hard and fast with everything they had."

• James Smith: "I was topside fighting fires and doing other damage control work throughout the duration of the attack. At the same time I was able to observe the jets flying overhead and I also observed the American flag flying from the mast. At no time did that flag hang limp from the mast."

Joe Meadors: "My only job during the attack was to make sure that the flag was flying so every few minutes I would walk out to the signal bridge up at the mast."

The American survivors of Israel's brutal terrorist attack on the USS Liberty have charged that the nature of the assault most definitively constituted a war crime.

For example, survivor Lloyd Painter recalled:"I personally witnessed the machine-gunning of life rafts as they floated by. The Israeli torpedo boat crew members raked the life rafts thoroughly with machine gun fire, making sure that if there had been anyone in the liferafts that they would have not survived."

Another survivor, Don Bocher, pointed out that plans to abandon

the ship were called off because the life rafts had been shot up. In fact, shooting life rafts on a ship in distress is a war crime.

Josey Toth Linen, whose brother Stephen died on the Liberty, also noted: "My brother was sent to the bridge of the ship to find out who the planes were and where they came from. They had no markings. That's against the Geneva Rules of War right there ... He was cut down by the planes."

Therefore, Israel did indeed commit war crimes in the course of its unwarranted attack on the friendly American vessel.

Survivor David Lewis adds:"Had [the ship] sunk, I assume that when debris washed ashore the next day, it would have been blamed on Egypt ... Helicopter gunships, I'm sure, would have picked off survivors if we had abandoned ship. They were sent there to finish us off. The aircraft were sent to make us incommunicado so we couldn't send an SOS out. The torpedo boats were sent to sink us.

"And the helicopters were sent to pick off survivors. It was a perfectly executed military operation. If you look at the photographs of the Liberty after the attack, on the first strafing run they used heat-seeking missiles that took out the tuning section of every transmitter on the ship. In less than two seconds they had taken out all our communication capability."

The ship's captain, W. L. McGonagle, echoed the concerns of the other survivors, noting that: "It appeared from the ferocity of the attack that the intent of the attackers was to sink the ship. Maybe they hoped to have no survivors so that they would not be held accountable for the attack after it occurred."

On September 20, 2001, in the wake of the 9-11 terrorist tragedy, President George W. Bush brashly advised the entire world: "Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists."

What took place on June 8, 1967 was an act of terrorism, by any definition. On that day Israel demonstrated to the American people that it was "with the terrorists." Rather, they were the terrorists.

And this is a nation that controls one of the largest nuclear arsenals on the face of our planet.

On the basis of this one crime alone—the murder of 34 Americans and the wounding of 174 others—Israel not only forfeited any right to call itself an "ally" of the United States but likewise forfeited the right to be permitted to maintain nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Should the nations of the world ever choose to drive into Israel and forcibly disassemble Israel's nuclear arsenal—which is almost certainly what will have to be done—it would be most fitting if the rallying cry would simply be this: "Remember the Liberty"

Chapter Six

Israel's Sacred Secret: The Zionist Golem as the Primary Driving Force Behind Nuclear Escalation in the Middle East

Lest there be any doubt that Israel's nuclear weapons of mass destruction are the cornerstone of Israel's national defense policy or that this is founded on a deep-rooted, underlying religious (even racist) fanaticism—upon which basis it can be rightly said that this alone raises very real fears for the world, knowing that Israel maintains this dangerous arsenal—also bear in mind the vital point that Israel's founding father, David Ben-Gurion, attached a fervent, even mystical, religious significance to his nation's nuclear weapons development program.

According to Israeli historian Michael Karpin, writing in his book, The Bomb in the Basement, Ben-Gurion referred to the Jewish money lords who donated some $40 million in the 1950s (the equivalent of $250 million today) to seed the weapons program as the"makdishim,"or consecrators, and to their contributions as "hakdasha," consecration. Karpin noted:

> Both of these Hebrew words derive from the word kadosh, sacred, which is also the root of the world Mikdash, or Temple—the holiest institution of Judaism. And inside the Temple is the Kodesh Hakodashim, the Holy of Holies.
>
> And like the Temple, which was erected with the contributions of the children of Israel (Exodus 25:1), so too Israel's nuclear program would be built with contributions.
>
> In Ben-Gurion's eyes, the nuclear project was holy. [Emphasis added.]

Although pro-Israel propagandists in the Zionist-dominated mass media—in the United States in particular—often refers to the dangers of "The Islamic Bomb," the very real existing danger in the world today is "The Jewish Bomb."

Although, of course, the Israeli government effectively denies officially that the Jewish Hell Bomb even exists, the American government—in obediance to Israel and its lobby in Washington—stages a bizarre charade in which it lamely pretends for public relations purposes to believe Israel's claims regarding its nuclear arsenal.

It was thus for good reason that the late Israeli dissident, Dr. Israel Shahak, referred to Israel's bomb as one of the "open secrets" that the

world needs to address. And yet, despite the fact that—in a February 20, 2003 speech in Jerusalem to a delegation from the powerful Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations—former Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres formally abandoned Israel's long-standing policy of denying its nuclear weapons capabilities, acknowleding the existence of the nuclear Golem, that fact received very little notice in the American press. Instead, it was noted—however briefly—in the pages of American Jewish community newspapers, a classic "wink and nod" to the ugly truth that Israel for so long denied.

Now, in reality, it would be false to say that the truth about Israel's nuclear capacity never receives any mention in the American media. It does. But such mention is rare and largely restricted to the pages of the elite media and in scholarly journals focusing on military and political affairs.The average American has little understanding (or knowledge) — if any—about the dangers of Israel's Golem and the impact it has had on nuclear escalation in the Middle East.

Most Americans, if truth be told, are convinced that the "Evil Muslims" are building nuclear weapons to "Get Israel" and to "Kill America, the Great Satan" but they have no understanding that it was Israel that started the whole Middle East nuclear mess in the first place.

There are some American journalists who have broached the subject, however discretely. For example, in the March 6, 2005 issue of The Washington Post, discussing nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, Walter Pincus, one of the Post's premier correspondents and an American of the Jewish faith, admitted candidly:

> While U.S. policy has been to support the concept of a nuclear-free Middle East, administration officials almost never acknowledge publicly that Israel's possession of such weapons may be a factor in the actions of other regional powers, such as Iran, Syria, Egypt or Saudi Arabia. The CIA regularly omits mention of Israel's nuclear weapons in its six-month reports to Congress on weapons of mass destruction.

The article noted that while "Israel refuses to confirm its possession of nuclear weapons"—although, as we've pointed out, Israeli officials have made public statements which have effectively acknowledged the existence of those weapons—"U.S. intelligence has reported to Congress that Israel has had a stockpile since the 1970s that is estimated to include between 200 and 300 bombs and missiles."

Considering all of this, it is iimportant to note that Israel has repeat-

edly refused to sign the international Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or to open its nuclear programs to inspection. It is thus no wonder that Mohamed El Baradei, the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), once charged that Israel's instransigence regarding nuclear disclosure has "served as an incentive for countries to arm themselves with equal or similar weapons capacity."

In that same vein, former Iranian President Ali Akbar Hashemi Ransanjani noted that his own country has been subjected to abuse from the United States, which has accused Iran of seeking to build nuclear weapons, even "when Israel has stockpiled banned nuclear weapons without any protest or opposition from the IAEA.

Meanwhile, Prince Saud Faisal, the foreign minister of Saudi Arabia, likewise pointed out that "Iran is always mentioned but no one mentions Israel, which has (nuclear) weapons already. We wish the international community would enforce the movement to make the Middle East a nuclear-free zone."

John F. Kennedy was nobody's fool. When he made the bold decision to take on Israel's drive for nuclear weapons, he knew that it was going to be difficult. But the truth is that his opposition to Israel's nuclear intentions was just as much the cornerstone of his entire foreign policy just as Israel's determination to have the bomb was the cornerstone of Israel's geostrategic policy. Israeli historian Avner Cohen summarized JFK's position well:

> . . . President Kennedy was determined to thwart Israel's nuclear quest___ And for Kennedy, Israel was at the center of the battle against nuclear proliferation. The case of Israel, he believed, was where the new nonproliferation norm should begin. Israel was perceived as the dividing line between the old and irreversible nuclear proliferation of the past and the new nonproliferation of the future.

However, JFK was removed from office prematurely and—as we shall see later in these pages—there is strong evidence pointing toward Israeli involvement in the JFK assassination and as a direct and immediate consequence, Israel's nuclear ambitions were, at last, unhindered.

Still, the fact that it was Israel—not Iraq, not Iran—that started the arms race in the Middle East is something that most Americans don't seem to understand.

This, of course, can be explained by the simple fact that the mass media in America is so bent in favor of Israel that even simple truths can

be distorted. A perfect example of this was the lead story in the April 15, 2007 of The New York Times. The story, entitled "With Eye on Iran, Rivals Also Want Nuclear Power"—by the very nature of its headline—implied that Iran's nuclear intentions were somehow the cause of growing escalation of interest in nuclear power by other states in the region. The story noted that Saudi Arabia,Turkey and Egypt—roughly a dozen states in the Middle East region—were now moving toward nuclear power.

But buried in the rather lengthy story was this admission: "The Middle East has seen hints of a regional nuclear arms race before. After Israel obtained its first weapon four decades ago, several countries took steps down the nuclear road," and the further confirmation that "Decades ago, it was Israel's drive for nuclear arms that brought about the region's first atomic jitters."

However, of course, The New York Times returned to the current mantra: "Iran is to blame." Yet, of course, the evidence shows that Israel has been at the center of nuclear weapons escalation in the Middle East, precisely because it was the first state to go nuclear and, as a direct consequence, other states in the region (with good reason) determined that they, too, should be able to provide with their own national defense, precisely as the Israelis were doing.

If anything, if truth be told, the Arab and Muslim states of the Middle East—recognizing the deep-rooted fanaticism and religious foundation of Israel's nuclear weapons policy—cannot be faulted for believing that they were potential targets, in a pre-emptive war, of Israel's Golem, precisely because of what we have documented already in these pages. In light of the history of Israel's determined drive to build a nuclear arsenal, coupled with Israel's now-firmly-cemeted "special relationship" with the United States, can there be any wonder why the Arab and Muslim states that Israel perceives to be its enemies would not have the desire to have the means to defend themselves from such an alliance?

Earlier we noted the honesty of Washington Post correspondent Walter Pincus in baring discussion of Israel's role in the escalation of nuclear weapons in the Midde East. This, in fact, was not the first time that Pincus had broached the topic.

On April 17, 2003 Pincus acknowledged in a story relating to angry claims by the Bush administration relating to Syria's alleged "weapons of mass destruction," that Syria built its arsenal as an "equalizer" and that "Israel's arms spurred [Syria's] fears."

Although, at the time of Pincus' story, Syria asked for a United Nations resolution calling for nuclear arms inspections all across the Middle East—including Israel—few expected that the United States wouldl rally behind Syria's request. And, of course, the United States did

not, despite the official U.S. position that, according to then-Secretary of State Colin Powell, the United States would like to see the entire region free of weapons of mass destruction. Pincus's article regarding Syria's drive for a military arsenal designed to counter Israel's Golem is instructive indeed. Pincus wrote:

> Syria's current arsenal of chemical warheads and Scud missiles to deliver them was started more than 30 years ago to counter Israel's development and possession of nuclear weapons, according to present and former U.S. intelligence officials.
>
> "They have been developing chemical weapons as a force equalizer with the Israelis," a former senior intelligence analyst said yesterday. "Hafez al-Assad, the present president's father, saw chemicals as a way to threaten the Israelis and an equalizer for their nuclear program."
>
> Assad knew, the former analyst said, that "military aid from the Soviets would never be able to match what Israel developed in the nuclear field and received from the U.S."
>
> Syria's possession of chemical weapons was an important part of the Bush administration's recent, week-long verbal offensive against Damascus. But it also has brought attention briefly to another highly sensitive issue: the impact that Israel's nuclear arsenal has had on its enemies in the Middle East.
>
> The consensus from Middle East experts is that almost every country in the region has pursued weapons of mass destruction programs - and they have done so primarily because of the arsenal that Israel has built up, said Joseph Cirincione, head of the nonproliferation program of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
>
> "You can't get rid of chemical or biological or nuclear programs in Arab countries unless you also address the elimination of Israel's nuclear and chemical programs," Cirincione said yesterday.
>
> The Defense Intelligence Agency has reported that Syria's program to develop chemical offensive weapons began in the early 1970s "as a result of a perceived Israel threat."

> Damascus obtained its first chemical weapons from Egypt just before the war in October 1973, according to a CIA historical paper.
>
> In 1999, when Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak was facing enormous U.S. pressure to sign the Chemical Weapons Convention, he refused to do so until Israel signed the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). "Why do Israelis talk about Egypt's military power and do not talk about the development of their [Israel's] defense?" Mubarak was quoted as saying at the time.
>
> Neither Egypt nor Syria has signed the chemical treaty; Israel signed it in 1993, but has not ratified it. And Israel has not signed the NPT.
>
> The first Syrian reaction to complaints about its chemical weapons was to focus on Israel's arsenal. Last week, when Israeli officials repeated claims by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon that former Iraqi president Saddam Hussein had transferred biological and chemical weapons to Syria, a Syrian spokesman said Sharon's aim was "to divert attention from the nuclear, chemical and biological arsenal that Israel possesses."

In the meantime, the civilian pro-Israel war hawks in the Bush administration continued to bang the drums for war against Syria, despite the fact that—once again—America's military professionals do not consider Syria a threat to American interests, any more than they previously considered Iraq to be a threat to America.

Clearly, the record shows that Israel—and Israel alone—is responsible for the escalation of all manner of military hardware in the Middle East, not just nuclear weapons alone.

Israel's "sacred" Golem is a dangerous cause of instability in the region (and for the world at large). And yet, to the dismay of many Americans, their own government is "giving a pass" to Israel's nuclear Golem even as the American government agitates against other nations in the region for looking out for their own defense needs.

And what makes the situation all the more frightenng is that not only is the American government "looking the other way," it is also providing other means of support that helps advance Israel's nuclear aims. The chapters which follow examine this phenomenon in further—and disturbing—detail.

Chapter Seven

American Tax-Exempt Non-Profit Groups Bankroll Israel's Nuclear Golem

American supporters of Israel can be justly proud As a consequence of their substantial political clout, through the aegis of their lobby groups that have such a tremendous impact on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, massive U.S. foreign aid giveaways to Israel—made possible by members of Congress who are overwhelmingly loyal to the interests of Israel—have made that tiny Middle East state a genuine world powerhouse, all a direct result of massive multi-billions of dollars in transfusions of U.S. treasury giveaways.

All of this not to mention the fact that U.S. military aid to Israel—supplemented with direct grants of U.S. military technology (and direct theft of U.S. technology by Israeli spies operating on American soil)— has made little Israel by far the most powerful single state in the entire Middle East.

In fact, American taxpayers are both directly and indirectly subsidizing Israel's nuclear weapons powerhouse, said to be perhaps the fifth largest in the entire world.

Just a few facts about Israel's status were leaked to the American public in an unusual advertisement that appeared in a recent (2007) edition of The New York Times.

Sponsored by the American Technion Society (ATS) which is a support group for the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology in Israel (described as "among the world's leading science and technology universities), the advertisement brags, in a headline, that "Israel's Only Natural Resource [is] the Brainpower of its People."

The advertisement, which is a pitch for financial contributions to help the ATS help Israel, through the work of the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, reads as follows:

> Without oil, without enough water and with landmass the size of New Jersey, Israel is focused on developing its only natural resource: the brainpower of its people. Israel has become a world leader in science, technology and medicine.
>
> It has more technology-based start-up companies per capita than any other country; more companies on Nasdaq than any country except the United States and Canada; and a standard of living that places it firmly among First World Nations.

The high-sounding rhetoric of this advertisement belies the truth. People who know of the massive U.S. financial support for Israel—particularly in the wake of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the assumption to power of his successor, Lyndon Johnson, who was primarily responsible for energizing U.S. foreign aid to Israel—cannot help but note that the ATS advertisement fails to mention that it has been U.S. taxpayer support that has helped Israel blossom.

Any other nation that received the kind of unqualified U.S. financial backing that Israel has enjoyed could almost certainly brag of the same accomplishments attributed to "the brainpower of its people."

The ATS's foreign principal in Israel, by the way, also happens to be a major fount of financial resources directed toward Israel's program for assembling and maintaining Israel's officially non-existent, but nonetheless substantial, arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, the singular source of conflict in the Middle East today, often cited as the very reason why other Middle East nations—from Iraq to Syria and on to Iran and Saudi Arabia—have evinced interest in building their own nuclear weapons arsenals.

What makes the ATS fundraising for Israel so notable is that ATS—which is helping a foreign university which is an agency of a foreign nation—is that ATS is, by its own admission, a not-for-profit organization with 501(c)3 status granted by the Internal Revenue Service. Thus, this means that contributions to the ATS are eligible as charitable deductions to a public charity. And American supporters of Israel—who include many top-level billionaires and millionaires—can reduce their annual contribution to the IRS by making giant contributions to help their favorite foreign nation and its nuclear arsenal.

So while Americans suffer at home, with middle class families unable to send their kids through college, senior citizens unable to buy medicine and many people unable to afford basic health care, as roads and bridges crumble, and young Americans are dying in Iraq (and possibly soon even in Iran) to protect Israel—and while disease and starvation and homelessness remain sore spots on the American scene—struggling Americans who have trouble paying their own taxes are actually directly paying the bills for Israel's domestic and military advances and doing so indirectly as well, as super-rich supporters of Israel get tax breaks through their donations to an American tax exempt organization that subsidizes life in Israel to the point that Israel (in reality, a welfare recipient) is thriving.

That, American taxpayers are told, is what American democracy is all about. "We have to pay our taxes to keep the world safe."

And that includes subsidizing Israel's nuclear Golem ...

Chapter Eight

Has Israel's Golem Been Merged With the American Nuclear Weapons Arsenal?

Not only are American taxpayers subsidizing Israel's nuclear Golem through tax-exempt non-profit organizations, but the amazing truth is that an effective argument can be made that America's own nuclear facilities have been merged with those of Israel. Here are the facts:

An Israeli company, Magal Security Systems, owned in part by the government of Israel, is in charge of security for the most sensitive nuclear power and weapons storage facilities in the United States.

The largest perimeter security company in the world, Magal started out as a division of Israeli Aircraft Industries (IAI), which was owned in part by the government of Israel.

In recent years, however, Magal evolved into a publicly traded company, although IAI (and thus the government of Israel) still holds a substantial share in the highly successful firm.

What this means is that the government of Israel has control over the security of America's nuclear weapons.

Supporters of Israel say that this is a splendid idea, since Israel is said to be America's closest ally. However, there are some critics who question the propriety of America's nuclear security being in the hands of any foreign nation, particularly Israel, which is at the very center of the conflict over nuclear escalation in the Middle East.

Magal's global interests are broad-ranging. Having secured 90 percent of Israel's borders through a wide array of "space age" technology, Magal has now branched out internationally. Not only does Magal provide security for American nuclear facilities, but it also patrols most major nuclear facilities in Western Europe and Asia.

The Israeli firm guards Chicago's O'Hare Airport and, for the last 15 years, has kept watch on the queen of England's famed Buckingham Palace in London. And Magal safeguards 90 percent of the American prisons that utilize electronic systems.

Magal brags that its other clients around the globe include: borders, airports, industrial sites, communication centers, military installations, correctional facilities, government agencies, VIP estates and residences, commercial buildings and storage yards. There is hardly a major country or major enterprise that does not have Magal's security specialists keeping a close watch on their activities.

Clearly, Magal is no small enterprise. While 27 percent of its total sales are in the Israeli market, its largest market is in North America, which currently accounts for 35 percent of its sales.

However, Magal's American outreach is expected to increase substantially, especially now that the firm has set up a Washington office,

which will promote its products to federal agencies and to the members of Congress, who provide funding for federally supervised security projects across the country at all levels: local, state and national.

Current U.S. Homeland Security Czar Michael Chertoff is not only a devout supporter of Israel but is also the son of a woman who has strong Israeli ties—even including service with El Al, the national airline of Israel. Magal, owned in part by Israeli Aircraft Industries, will be the clear-cut favorite in the eyes of officials in Washington who have the power to grant lucrative security contracts.

At the moment, Magal has four U.S.-based subsidiaries: two in California, Stellar Security Products, Inc. and Perimeter Products Inc., as well as the New York-based Smart Interactive Systems, Inc., and the Virginia-based Dominion Wireless, Inc.

All told, the Israeli company holds a 40 percent share in the worldwide market in perimeter intrusion detection systems and is working to expand its business in the protection of oil pipelines.

Magal is also said to be interested in guarding water lines around the globe, particularly in the United States. In fact, Magal may have an inside shot at getting a monopoly in guarding America's water supplies.

On July 19, 2006, the Bush administration's Environmental Protection Agency announced a "partnership" with the Israeli Ministry of National Infrastructures to improve "water supply system security in the United States and Israel." Since Magal is so highly respected in Israel, it's an even bet Magal will soon be guarding the U.S. water supply.

The very idea that the American nuclear weapons arsenals are being "guarded" by a company owned, even in part, by the government of any foreign nation—Israel or otherwise—should be of great concern to every American. And, needless to say, it is a matter of concern to other nations that perceive Israel's Golem a threat to their own security.

Although there are those who argue that Israel's security is a matter of American interests, there are many who believe otherwise and who say that the interests of the two nations are not one and the same.

And as long as America continues to maintain a "special relationship" with Israel, even to the point of permitting Israel to have effective supervision of the American nuclear arsenal—which is what the special arrangement with the Israeli company, Magal, constitutes—the United States can not pretend, in any way, to be an honest broker vis-a-vis the nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

The special arrangement with Magal is an abandonment by the United States of its own nuclear arsenal to the hands of a foreign nation, one which clearly does not have America's interests—but instead, its own—in mind. And for Americans that's a frightening reality indeed.

Chapter Nine

"Israel: Give Up Your Golem" U.S. Army War College Analysts Believe that Iran Would Abandon Its Nuclear Program if Israel Did

In the wake of a growing American media cacophony about Iran's purported aims of building its own nuclear arsenal—"news" that has largely been stimulated by bellicose rhetoric in Israel itself—the distinguished Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, which is a training ground for the "best and the brightest" among up-and-coming military officers, has taken quite a different approach to the matter

A report published in 2006 by the War College openly targeted Israel's controversial—but officially nonexistent—arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction. Although the report—titled "Getting Ready for a Nuclear-Ready Iran"—has been noted in high-level policymaking circles and mentioned in academic and military spheres of influence, the entirety of the report's context has been largely ignored when it has been mentioned at all in the mainstream media..

While the report asserted that neither talk of a military attack on Iran by Israel nor ongoing American diplomatic initiatives are likely to stop Iran from pursuing its goals and that either course could result in disaster, the report concluded by asserting that Israel itself should take the initiative and close down its Dimona nuclear reactor, turn over nuclear materiel to a third party, and allow the International Atomic Energy Agency to maintain regular inspection of Israel's nuclear operations. The report urged the United States to put pressure on Israel to make this possible.

America's military thinkers believe that if Israel were to curtail its nuclear offensive, the United States would be more easily able to convince other nuclear states in the Middle East to do likewise. It is, in fact, a historic truth that it was Israel's determined push for nuclear weapons—a documented foundation of that nation's geopolitical defense policy—that led Arab nations, Pakistan and Iran to pursue nuclear weapons in response.

What is particularly notable about this report calling for Israel to effectively "de-nuke" is that the co-author of that report is Patrick Clawson, deputy director of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP), a well-established pro-Israel lobby in Washington.

However, WINEP is generally identified with Israel's so-called "peace" movement, which has been at odds with the elements in Israel associated with former Likud Prime Ministers Ariel Sharon and his predecessor, Binyamin Netanyahu, who is preparing to make another bid for taking power in Israel again. And, of course, Netanyahu is an all of the fanatic pro-Israel "neo-conservative" elements who have been directing

U.S. Middle East policy in the Bush administration and who are in the forefront of the push for U.S. military action against Iran in order to prevent that nation from advancing its nuclear aims.

All of this suggests that, once again, internal Israeli political conflicts are flowing over into the American political process with—in this instance—the top-notch officers at the Army War College allying with some sensible forces in Israel's "left wing" who recognize the dangers of nuclear proliferation.

Thus, the men who are charged with fighting America's wars are taking a public stand that could—if their advice is followed—help defuse the problem of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, if only Israel agrees to go along and the Bush administration sees the logic of what at least some of America's military leaders are proposing.

The predominant evidence suggests, based on what has appeared in a variety of media—although not publicized to the extent that it should be—is that key forces in the American military oppose the push for war against Iran precisely as they stood in opposition—at least behind the scenes in the lead-up to the invasion—to the war against Iraq.

And what is particularly interesting to note is this: What few media references there have been to the report by the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College calling for the United States to put pressure on Israel over the issue of its nuclear arsenal have largely failed to mention that one key facet of the report.

Instead—and this is very telling—media reports have focused on the fact that the report has said that Iran's drive to achieve nuclear weapons status is a fait accompli. Virtually all of the commentaries and news items mentioning the report (and they have been few in number) have left readers with the implication that the U.S. military believes that military action is the only solution, when, in fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

These media reports have clearly and deliberately obscured the critical bottom-line finding of the report: that the United States has the responsibility of using its influence on Israel to stop its own nuclear weapons production and open up its Golem to international inspection.

So it is, once again, that we find the mass media in the United States brazenly distorting the position of the military vis-a-vis the precarious American position in the Middle East (and in the world) arising from the U.S.-Israel axis that pivots around the existence of Israel's nuclear Golem. This is not only a disservice to the truth, but a strike against serious efforts to bring peace to the Holy Land and put a stop to the very real danger to a world held hostage, a planet that may well now be on the road to Armageddon.

Chapter Ten

The "Poisonous" Relationship: Jewish Intellectual Calls for Reversal of U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Israel's Golem

A well-known and highly regarded Canadian academic, the son of German Jews, sent Shockwaves through pro-Israel circles in the West. Michael Neumann, a professor of philosophy at Trent University in Ontario, Canada, called for the United States to break its "special relationship" with Israel and, instead, openly and boldly side with the Palestinians and the Arab and Muslim states around the globe. He urged the United States to lead an international coalition to force Israel to accept a negotiated peace settlement with the Palestinians and—most importantly—give up its giant arsenal of nuclear weapons.

Writing in his book, The Case Against Israel, Neumann candidly asserted, based on his own study of the problem, that although he considers himself "pro-Israel and pro-Jewish" that it is still "definitely the Palestinians, not Israel, who deserve the world's support."

Neumann views "the Zionist project"—the displacement of native Palestinians and the establishment of Jewish settlements in Palestine, leading to the creation of Israel—as being, in his words "entirely unjustified" and that "some form of violent resistance" by the Christian and Muslim natives of the land was to be expected. In the end, Neumann said, "The illegitimacy of the Zionist project was the major cause of all the terror and warfare that it aroused."

Neumann dismissed the standard claim that Israel is any sort of "special" friend of the United States and disregards the notion that the much-touted "bond" between the two countries is beneficial to U.S. interests. The relationship, he asserted in no uncertain terms, "has turned poisonous to America's security and its future."Neumann said it is now time for action. The Canadian professor wrote:

> America would be far better off on the other side of the Israel/Palestine conflict. It would instantly gain the warm friendship of Arab oil producers and obtain far more valuable allies in the war on terror: not only the governments of the entire Muslim world, but a good portion of the Muslim fundamentalist movement!
>
> The war on terror, which seems so unwinnable, might well be won at nominal cost, and quickly. Perhaps, the most likely scenario would simply involve an embargo on Israel sponsored by the U.S. in cooperation with the United Nations.

> If this happens, Israel might have to be made the object of the kind of coalition forged against Iraq in the first Gulf War. Of course, against Israel the coalition would be far broader and stronger, including all the countries of the former Soviet Union, Iran, Libya, Pakistan and many others. And though Israel is quite strong enough to persist in its policies without U.S. support, it could not stand up to such a coalition. Israel would be forced to follow its own best interests.

Neumann also believes that if the United States were to come down on Israel and take a firm stand against this nation that many in the world perceive to be a rogue state, it would go a long way toward reducing the risk of a nuclear holocaust.

Neumann said that there are two main reasons why some nations resist surrendering their own nuclear arsenals: "fear of American attack," and what Neumann calls "the outrageous exemption of Israel from non-proliferation initiatives." Neumann wrote:

> It is simply absurd to suppose that any serious effort to stem the development of nuclear weapons can proceed in the absence of any attempt to disarm Israel, which is estimated to possess between 200 and 500 nuclear warheads. Having launched its own satellites, it clearly has the capacity to hit targets anywhere in the world, and it possesses cruise missiles that have hit targets 950 miles away. Until it is forced either to disarm or to establish good relations with its neighbors, the pace of proliferation will simply increase. On the other hand, U.S. efforts to neutralize the Israeli nuclear threat would win support for nonproliferation efforts from Pakistan and Iran.

Ultimately, Neumann believes, this tough love from the United States would be of benefit to Israel itself and ensure the tiny yet wealthy and powerful nations survival in what is now a very hostile world.

While some years ago in Israel the most popular song was the politically charged anthem, "The Whole World is Against Us," the sad truth is that the song title is essentially correct.

But Neumann's book provides a solution to the problem of Israel that could be workable indeed and bring Israel and its supporters worldwide into the community of mankind.

Chapter Eleven

The U.S-Israel-India Axis and Its Implications for Nuclear Proliferation

Recent U.S. overtures toward India—giving a friendly nod to India's nuclear weapons ambitions—bely U.S. claims of working to avert nuclear proliferation. And, as the record demonstrates, these American policies can be directly traced to the intrigues in official Washington by Israel's powerful well-funded lobby.

The truth is that despite everything else you may have heard in the major media, the Israeli lobby has been the primary force behind the Bush administration's much-heralded new policy of promoting better relations between the United States and India.

When President George W Bush enthusiastically welcomed India's Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, during his much-heralded trip to Washington, every seasoned "insider" in the American capital knew the real reason for the loudly-touted new friendship between the United States and India: it came about because the alliance had the approval of the pro-Israel lobby in Washington.

As if to underscore the point for those who may have somehow missed what was really going on, a clique of Washington-based American "neo-conservatives" known for their devotion to the interests of Israel banded together to form "the U.S. India League," which is promoting congressional and public support for the Bush administration's initiative to firm up a US-Indian strategic relationship.

Components of that strategic relationship—as outlined by the administration and endorsed by the pro-Israel stalwarts—include U.S. support for the expansion of India's nuclear development along with the expansion of U.S. economic relations with India which, in recent years, has emerged as a major site for the "outsourcing" of U.S. jobs, particularly in the service industries.

The names of those associated with the US India League are a virtual roster of some of Israel's most vociferous boosters in Washington: They include:

• Don Feder, the league's "executive director," a syndicated columnist who is the author of the book, A Jewish Conservative Looks at Pagan America;

• Alan Keyes, a former American deputy ambassador to the United Nations, whose path to power came as a result of having been the Harvard room-mate of William Kristol. Kristol is publisher of the neo-conservative Weekly Standard magazine and the son of ex-Trotskyite and neo-conservative "godfather," Irving Kristol, who—now along with his son—is one of Israel's leading strategists in Washington;

• Thomas Donnelly, former deputy executive director of the Project for the New American Century, founded by the aforementioned William Kristol, which once declared that America needed a "new Pearl Harbor" in order to begin expanding its imperial interests abroad;

• Kenneth R. Timmerman, a veteran political polemicist whose works have been praised by the likes of Simon Wiesenthal, whose eponymous "Center" based in Los Angeles, has become a major source for pro-Israel propaganda.Timmerman is now promoting the theory that Iran was involved in the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks on America; and

• Clifford D. May, a former correspondent for The New York Times and former Republican National Committee official, now chairman of the policy committee of the Committee on the Present Danger, one of the foremost pro-Israel lobby groups in Washington;

That these pro-Israel tacticians are now pushing for expansion of the U.S. relationship with India comes as no surprise to those who have watched the growing alliance between Israel and India that has been in development for just over a decade.

The historical record shows that—acting in tandem with a nest of highly-paid lobbyists on the payrolls of the government of India, private Indian financial interests, and well-fixed American hustlers who want to profit from U.S. business deals in India—the Israeli lobby played the primary role in "fixing" the new U.S.-Indian relationship.

In fact, for some years, elements of the Israeli lobby and the increasingly wealthy and influential Indian community in the United States have been working closely together in Washington on matters of joint tactical interest. While the U.S. supplies billions of taxpayer dollars to Israel, propping up that country's domestic industry, Israel, in turn, has used U.S. largesse to underwrite its massive arms industry, which counts India as one of its biggest customers.

In addition, Israeli financiers are starting to invest heavily in India where—as previously noted and as many displaced American workers now well know—U.S.-based service industries (such as some of the credit card giants, among many others) are "outsourcing" jobs at substantially reduced pay rates to Indian workers. So the Israeli benefit is more than just in the geopolitical realm.

As part of their argument for the new U.S.-Indian strategic relationship, the Bush administration and its allies in the neo-conservative network in Washington are saying that the U.S.-India alliance is a "good" thing that is needed to counter China's growing economic, political and military might in Asia.

This may sound like a sensible argument to some who have fears about China's intentions. However, when one considers the fact that

China today has such a substantial military arsenal because, for the last 25 years, Israel's arms industry (subsidized by U.S. taxpayer dollars) was one of China's leading suppliers of conventional arms and arms technology—much of which originated in the United States in the first place—that argument is disingenuous, if not hypocritical, to those who look at the bigger picture.

And it is exactly that bigger picture that Israel and its lobby in Washington would prefer Americans ignore. The Israeli lobby wants to build up India not so much as a counter to China but, instead, as a counter to the Muslim-dominated republic of Pakistan, India's longtime enemy.

In addition, Israel knows that India, which was long allied with the Arab world, as part of its traditional, independent-minded foreign policy, has been a firm supporter of a Palestinian state. As such, Israel hopes to use its new leverage with India—through the forging of U.S. support for India's nuclear ambitions—to effectively dissolve previous Indian support for Palestinian statehood.

All of these factors, however, ignore a key point: In India, there is widespread suspicion and concern—and not just in the substantial minority Muslim population, but also within the ruling Hindu-dominated Congress Party of Prime Minister Singh—regarding the developing "U.S.-Israel-India axis," which many Indians see as a threat to India's sovereignty and independence.

So although the Indian leader was the toast of the town in Washington, things ultimately may not be so comfortable for him back home in India as matters progress.

And it is probably worth noting that there are many Indians who believe that Israel's intelligence service, Mossad, played a covert role in the assassination of former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, a murder that preceded—and perhaps actually made possible—the new "opening" between Israel and India.

Here in the United States, the key figure in forging the Washington alliance of the Israeli lobby and the lobby for India, was former Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.) who—during his years in Congress—was such an audacious advocate for India that he often called himself the "Congressman from Bombay."

However, Solarz's interest in India was primarily because, as one of Israel's leading legislative legmen on Capitol Hill, he saw a tactical alliance between the Israeli lobby and the increasingly wealthy and powerful Indian community in America as a way of advancing Israel's interests. As such, it was not uncommon to also hear Solarz described as the "Congressman from Tel Aviv" and Solarz himself would have been the

last one to dispute the solid truth behind that moniker.

After leaving Congress, having been defeated for renomination, Solarz emerged as a paid lobbyist for the government of India, becoming its chief point man in Washington. In recent years, however, Solarz has been eclipsed by other lobbyists for India who also got in on the action when it became apparent that lobbying for India had the approval of the Israeli lobby.

Other big names who've signed on the Indian payroll have included former Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.), the GOP presidential nominee in 1996, and three major Democratic Party luminaries, former Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen and former Texas Gov.Ann Richards (now both deceased) as well as former Senate majority leader George Mitchell CD-Maine) and former Democratic Party National Chairman Robert Strauss and fellow top Washington-based Democratic power broker Vernon Jordan, a regular attendee at the international Bilderberg meetings.

In the meantime, India's lobby has had the support of influential pro-Israel lobbying units such as the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, and, of course, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a registered foreign lobby for Israel.

Ironically, although President Bush has made the issue of nuclear weapons proliferation a cornerstone of his foreign policy, having used that as the foundation for his war against Saddam Hussein and as the basis for his ongoing offensives against Iran and North Korea, the president seems to be looking the other way as far as India is concerned. While India has pledged that its nuclear program will be strictly peaceful in nature, India has yet to sign the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty.

All of this taken together is a tale of Washington profiteering and Israeli lobby power flexing at its ugliest. But the bigger problem is that all of this behind-the-scenes maneuvering impacts directly on the American position in a world ever-more concerned about the power of Israel's lobby in influencing and often directing U.S. foreign policy.

That the United States should give India's own nuclear "Golem" a boost in return for India effectively becoming a part of a U.S.-Israel-India Axis is another cause of concern that reflects even further on the dangers of Israel's quest for advancing its role on the global stage, using its own Golem as a means by which to achieve its imperial aims.

Chapter Twelve

JFK's Secret War With Israel: The Untold Story of How the Controversy Over Israel's Golem Was Central to the JFK Assassination Conspiracy.

Did John F. Kennedy's determined (and then secret) behind-the-scenes efforts to prevent Israel from building a nuclear weapons arsenal play a pivotal part in the events that led to his assassination on November 22, 1963?

Was Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, a front-line player in the JFK assassination conspiracy alongside elements of the CIA and international organized crime?

Why did Hollywood film-maker Oliver Stone fail to reveal—in his 1993 all-star JFK assassination extravaganza—that the hero of his epic, former New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, had privately concluded that the Mossad was ultimately the driving force behind JFK's murder?

With worldwide attention focused on the problems of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East—is it valid or appropriate to raise the question of possible Israeli complicity in the assassination of an American president?

These are just a few of the hotly controversial questions posed in my book, Final Judgment, which has emerged as a proverbial "underground best-seller" in the United States, the topic of heated debate on the Internet and the subject of angry exchanges in a variety of public forums.

What follows is a summary of my findings in Final Judgment, which is a 768-page volume documented with more than 1000 reference notes, an extensive question-and-answer section, 36 pages of photographs and charts, and ten appendices focusing on different aspects of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

In 1992, former U.S. Congressman Paul Findley, a liberal Republican, made the little-noticed but intriguing comment that "in all the words written about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned, despite the obvious fact Mossad complicity is as plausible as any of the other theories."

Where in the world could Findley—never known to be an extremist, by any means, and certainly not one given to venting conspiracy theories—have ever come up with such an assertion?

Actually, it's no so extraordinary a thesis, if one looks at the historical record, placing all of the conventional theories about the JFK assas-

sination in a new perspective, calculating in previously-little known details that shed stark light on the circumstances surrounding JFK's demise and the geopolitical crises in which the American president was embroiled at the time of his shocking murder.

In truth, even the most recently widely-disseminated exposition of JFK assassination theorizing—Oliver Stone's 1993 blockbuster film, JFK—did not present even the entire picture.

Although Stone portrayed former New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison as a hero for pointing the finger in the direction of elements of the U.S. military and intelligence networks as the guiding force behind JFK's murder, what Stone didn't tell his audience was something even more controversial: that, privately, after some years of research and reflection, Garrison had reached an even more startling determination: that the driving force behind JFK's murder was no less than Israel's feared intelligence service, the Mossad.

As astounding as it sounds, there's actually good reason to conclude that Garrison may have been looking in the right direction. And in this day when the debate over "weapons of mass destruction" is in the forefront of global discussion, it is not so extraordinary as thesis as it seems.

The 40th anniversary of the assassination of John F. Kennedy approaches and the fascination with the murder of America's 35th president won't go away. Assassination "buffs"—not just in the United States but around the globe—continue to chip away at the conclusions of the two official U.S. government investigations into the affair.

Although the 1979 report by a special committee of the U.S. Congress formally contradicted the earlier 1964 finding by the presidentially-appointed Warren Commission that alleged assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was acting alone and concluded instead that there was indeed the likelihood of a conspiracy behind the president's murder— hinting broadly at the involvement by organized crime—the congressional committee's final determination actually raised more questions, in some respects, than it answered.

In 1993 Hollywood's Oliver Stone entered the fray with his block-buster all-star extravaganza, JFK, which presented Stone's interpretation of the widely-publicized 1967-1969 JFK assassination inquiry by then-New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison.

Stone's film—featuring Kevin Costner as Garrison—raised the specter of involvement by elements of the so-called "military-industrial complex," along with a scattering of anti-Castro Cuban exiles, right-wing militants, and rogue Central Intelligence Agency operatives.The film told the story of Garrison's investigation, and ultimately unsuccessful prosecution, of New Orleans businessman Clay Shaw (then suspected of

being—and later proven to be—a collaborator with the CIA) for involvement in the JFK conspiracy.

However, as we now know, not even Stone was faithful to his hero. Longtime independent JFK assassination investigator A. J. Weberman has since revealed that, during the 1970s—well after Garrison's prosecution of Shaw—that Garrison was circulating the manuscript for a novel (never published) in which Garrison named Israel's Mossad as the mastermind of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

Garrison never said anything about this unusual thesis—at least publicly. But beginning in the mid-1980s and well into the present day, new evidence has emerged that not only points to good reason for Mossad motivation to move against John F. Kennedy, but also to the likelihood that not only Clay Shaw (Garrison's target) but other key figures often associated in published writings with the JFK assassination were indeed closely tied to the Mossad and doing its bidding.

And what is particularly interesting is that none of the individuals in question—Shaw included—happened to be Jewish. So the assertion that allegations of Mossad involvement are somehow "anti-Semitic "in nature fall flat on that fact alone. But Mossad complicity—as the record indicates—is a very real possibility.

Garrison's critics continue to assert that the New Orleans District Attorney couldn't make up his mind as to whom he thought had orchestrated the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This indeed was the primary complaint against the rambunctious and outspoken and quite colorful prosecutor: that he simply couldn't make up his mind.

And this is one of the reasons that even many of Garrison's supporters not only began to question his sincerity, but even as to whether Garrison's investigation was even worth the trouble.

In truth, Garrison did tend to shoot from the hip. That may have been his biggest mistake—one of many—in the course of his controversial inquiry into the murder of America's 35th president.

At one time or another, during the course of that investigation, Garrison pointed his finger at one or another various possible conspirators—ranging from "right-wing extremists" to "Texas oil barons" to "anti-Castro Cuban exiles" to "rogue CIA operatives." Occasionally Garrison went so far as to say that the conspiracy included a combination of those possible conspirators.

When Garrison finally brought one man to trial, widely respected New Orleans trade executive Clay Shaw, Garrison had narrowed his field, suggesting, primarily, that Shaw had been one of the lower-level players in the conspiracy.

According to Garrison, Shaw was essentially doing the bidding of

highly-placed figures in what has been described as "the military-industrial complex," that combination of financial interests and armaments manufacturers whose power and influence in official Washington—and around the world—is a very real force in global affairs.

Garrison suggested that Shaw and his co-conspirators had multiple motivations stimulating their decision to move against President Kennedy. Among other things, he asserted:

• The conspirators opposed JFK's decision to begin withdrawing U.S. forces from Indochina;

• They were angry at his failure to provide military cover support for Cuban exiles attempting to topple Fidel Castro in the botched Bay of Pigs invasion;

• They were bitter at JFK for firing longtime CIA Director Allen Dulles, a grand old man of the Cold War against the Soviet Union; and

• In addition, Garrison hinted, JFK's successor, Lyndon Johnson, may have wanted JFK removed from office for the purpose of claiming the crown for himself, but also because JFK and his younger brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, were not only plotting to remove Johnson from the Democratic national ticket in 1964, as well as conducting federal criminal investigations of many of Johnson's closest associates and financial backers—even including in the realm of organized crime, many of whom, the historical record shows, had close (albeit little known) ties to Israel and its intelligence service, the Mossad

In the end, after a relatively brief deliberation, the jury hearing the Shaw case acquitted Shaw. It was only later—much later—that evidence emerged that Shaw had indeed been a CIA informant, Shaw's protestations the contrary.

Only in recent years has it been determined, for example, that the American CIA was deliberately sabotaging Garrison's investigation from within, not to mention providing assistance to Shaw's defense. And although there are those who continue to say that Shaw's acquittal "proved" that Shaw had nothing whatsoever to do with the JFK conspiracy, the bigger picture suggests quite the contrary.

Shaw was involved with something very murky and so were others in Shaw's circle of friends and associates. And they were, in turn, directly connected to the strange activities of Lee Harvey Oswald in New Orleans, the summer just prior to the assassination of John F. Kennedy, before Oswald's sojourn to Dallas. Dozens of writers—many with differing points of view—have documented all of this, time and again.

So although the "official" legend is that Jim Garrison believed that the CIA and the military-industrial complex were the prime movers behind JFK's murder, when all was said and done, however, Jim Garrison

had privately reached quite a different conclusion, one that remains largely unknown even to many people who worked with Garrison throughout the course of his investigation.

In fact, as noted, Garrison had decided—based on the entirety of everything that he had learned, from a wide variety of sources—that the most likely masterminds of the JFK assassination were operatives of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad.

The remarkable truth is that—although Garrison apparently didn't know it at the time, precisely because the facts had yet to be revealed—Garrison may have been on to something, far more than he realized.

The public record now demonstrates that in 1963 JFK was embroiled in a bitter secret conflict with Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion over Israel's drive to build the atomic bomb; that Ben-Gurion resigned in disgust, saying that because of JFK's policies, Israel's "existence [was] in danger."

Then upon JFK's assassination, U.S. policy toward Israel began an immediate 180-degree turnaround.

Israeli historian Avner Cohen's new book, Israel and the Bomb, confirms the conflict between JFK and Israel so powerfully that, Israel's Ha'aretz, declared Cohen's revelations would "necessitate the rewriting of Israel's entire history."

From Israel's perspective, writes Cohen, "Kennedy's demands [on Israel] seemed diplomatically inappropriate ... inconsistent with national sovereignty." In any case, Cohen pointed out, "the transition from Kennedy to [Lyndon] Johnson ... benefited the Israeli nuclear program."

Ethan Bronner, in The New York Times, called Israel's drive to build a nuclear bomb "a fiercely hidden subject." This explains why JFK researchers—and Jim Garrison—never considered an Israeli.

While all of this presents a strong motive for Israel to strike against JFK, even maverick Israeli journalist Barry Chamish acknowledges that there exists "a pretty cogent case" for Mossad collaboration with the CIA in the assassination conspiracy.

The fact is that when Jim Garrison prosecuted Clay Shaw with conspiracy in the assassination, Garrison had stumbled upon the Mossad link. Although (after his acquittal) Shaw was revealed to have been a CIA asset, in 1963 Shaw also served on the board of a Rome-based company, Permindex, which was (the evidence suggests) actually a front for a Mossad-sponsored arms procurement operation.

How and why Shaw happened to end up in association with this operation remains a mystery, but the very clear role of the Mossad in the activities of Permindex is beyond question, protestations notwithstanding. The evidence is strong indeed. Judge for yourself:

A primary shareholder in Permindex, the Banque De Credit Internationale of Geneva, was not only the fiefdom of Tibor Rosenbaum, a high-level and longtime Mossad official—indeed, one of the founding fathers of Israel—but also the chief money laundry for Meyer Lansky, "chairman" of the crime syndicate and long-time Israeli loyalist.

According to Meyer Lansky's sympathetic Israeli biographers: "After Israel became a state, almost 90 percent of its purchases of arms abroad was channeled through Rosenbaum's bank. The financing of many of Israel's most daring secret operations was carried out through the funds in [BCI]." BCI also served as a depository for the Permindex account.

That Tibor Rosenbaum's BCI was a controlling force behind the enigmatic Permindex entity places Israel and its Mossad in the very center of the conspiracy behind the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Note also that the chief executive and shareholder of Permindex was Louis Bloomfield of Montreal, a top figure in the Israeli lobby in Canada (and internationally) and a longtime operative of the family of World Jewish Congress chief Samuel Bronfman—an intimate Lansky business partner in the international traffic in bootleg whiskey during Prohibition and, much later, a leading patron of Israel.

Permindex was clearly the Israeli link to the JFK assassination. The Permindex link also explains the "French connection" featured in the documentary The Men Who Killed Kennedy, but which failed to tell the entire story:

• That Permindex was also involved in assassination attempts against French President Charles DeGaulle by the French "Secret Army Organization" (OAS) which itself had close ties to the Mossad.

• Like the OAS, the Israelis hated DeGaulle not only because he gave independence to Algeria, a major new Arab state, but also because DeGaulle, who had assisted Israel, had withdrawn support, objecting (as did JFK) to Israel's drive for an atomic arsenal.

• A French intelligence officer alleged to this author, in 1993, that the Mossad contracted out at least one of JFK's assassins—probably a Corsican hitman—through a French intelligence official disloyal to DeGaulle and who hated JFK for supporting Algerian independence.

There is also firm evidence—based on revelations by the late respected journalist Stewart Alsop—that JFK was also planning a strike against Red China's nuclear bomb program—a plan scuttled by Lyndon Johnson within a month of JFK's assassination.

During this same period, according to famed British intellience historian Donald McCormack, (writing under his nom de plume, Richard Deacon, in his book, The Israeli Secret Service) that Israel and Red China were involved in joint secret nuclear bomb research.

We now know, in addition, that a key player in the Permindex web, billionaire Israeli industrialist Shaul Eisenberg, emerged as the Mossad's liaison with China and ultimately played the key role in developing the massive global weapons transfers between Israel and China that came to public attention in the 1980s.

It is also not incidental that James Angleton, the CIA liaison to the Mossad, was a devoted partisan of Israel who not only orchestrated the scenario linking accused assassin Lee Oswald to the Soviet KGB but who also later circulated disinformation to confuse investigations into the assassination. The tales of Angleton's intrigues with the Mossad during the Cold War are legion.

As far as the oft-discussed "Mafia" connection to the JFK assassination, even "mainstream" sources on organized crime note that the Italian-American" Mafia" figures most often accused of being behind the assassination—Carlos Marcello of New Orleans and Santo Trafficante of Tampa, Florida—were actually subordinates of Mossad-associated Meyer Lansky. Marcello and Trafficante reported to Lansky—not vice versa.

In addition, the nephew and namesake of the infamous Chicago Mafia boss, Sam Giancana—also often fingered as a possible sponsor of the JFK assassination—has recently put forth the assertion that the real boss of the Chicago Mafia was an American Jewish associate of Meyer Lansky—one Hyman "Hal" Larner—who, while pulling the strings of Giancana and the Chicago Mafia, was also actively collaborating in international intrigue with Israel's Mossad.

It is no wonder that some critics suggest that perhaps Oliver Stone failed to mention these details in JFK because the film was financed by Arnon Milchan, an Israeli arms dealer-turned-Hollywood producer whom even CBS's Sixty Minutes has linked to smuggling of materiel to Israel's nuclear program—which, of course, just happened to be the bitter (and perhaps fatal) point of contention between JFK and Israel.

Although Israeli diplomat Uri Palti has declared all of this—as outlined in detail in this author's book, Final Judgment—to be "nonsense," and CIA-connected author Gerald Posner branded it "outlandish," and stridently pro-Israel conservative columnist George Will declared it "vicious intellectual licentiousness," The Los Angeles Times grudgingly admitted in 1997 that the thesis of Final Judgment was "novel indeed," saying it "weave [s] together some of the key threads in a tapestry that many say is unique."

And it should be noted, that although there are many who do believe that the CIA had a hand in the JFK assassination, quite a few of those same people are fearful of mentioning the likelihood of a Mossad role. Yet, as journalist Andrew Cockburn has pointed out:

"There has been since almost the earliest days of the Israeli state and the earliest days of the CIA a secret bond, basically by which Israeli intelligence did jobs for the CIA and for the rest of American intelligence. You can't understand what's been going on with American covert operations and the Israeli covert operations until you understand this secret arrangement."

There are at least three major books, by well-known journalists, who document the subterranean links between the CIA and the Mossad, not to mention, in one facet or another, aspects of JFK's bitter secret conflict with Israel, not only over nuclear arms policy, but over U.S. Middle East policy in general. In addition, these volumes demonstrate that U.S. policy did indeed do a drastic 180-degree turn-about upon the death of President Kennedy:

1) The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy by Pulitizer Prize-winning veteran New York Times journalist Seymour Hersh.

2) Dangerous Liasion: The Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship by husband-and-wife team, Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, both respected liberal journalists; and

3) Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations With a Militant Israel by Stephen Green, who has been associated with the very "mainstream" Council on Foreign Relations and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Hersh and Green, by the way, are Jewish. All three books were published by respected publishing houses.

All of these volumes make it very clear that JFK and Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion were at serious loggerheads, to the point that Ben-Gurion believed that JFK's policy was a threat to Israel's very survival-and said so. Upon JFK's assassination, American policy toward the Middle East did an amazing 180 degree turn-about-the most immediate result of the American president's murder. This is a cold, hard, indisputable fact not subject to debate. The evidence is all too clear.

Hersh has noted that the Israeli press and the world press "told the world that Ben-Gurion's sudden resignation was a result of his dissatisfaction with domestic political scandals and turmoil that were rocking Israel." However, Hersh went on to say, quite significantly, that there was "no way for the Israeli public" to know that there was "yet another factor" behind the resignation: specifically, in Hersh's words, Ben-Gurion's "increasingly bitter impasse with Kennedy over a nuclear-armed Israel." The final showdown with JFK over the nuclear bomb was clearly, the "primary reason" behind Ben-Gurion's resignation.

As we have seen, the drive to build a nuclear bomb was not only a

major aim of Israel's defense policy (its very foundation) and also a particular special interest of Ben-Gurion.

In any event, Seymour Hersh's revelations about JFK and Ben-Gurion have been eclipsed by a more recent volume on the same subject—one by an Israeli scholar, Avner Cohen. When Cohen released his 1999 book Israel and the Bomb (New York: Columbia University Press), the book created quite a sensation in Israel.

The "nuclear option" was not only at the very core of Ben-Gurion's personal worldview, but the very foundation of Israel's national security policy. The Israelis were essentially willing, if necessary, to "blow up the world"—including themselves—if they had to do so in order to defeat their Arab foes.

This is what Hersh notes Israeli nuclear planners considered "the Samson Option"—that, as Samson of the Bible, after being captured by the Philistines, brought down Dagon'sTemple in Gaza and killed himself along with his enemies. As Hersh put it, "For Israel's nuclear advocates, the Samson Option became another way of saying 'Never again," (in reference to preventing another Holocaust).

All of the evidence, taken together in the big picture, clearly demonstrates that it was indeed "The Samson Option" that was indeed the primary cause of Ben-Gurion's resignation.

The bottom line is that—in 1963—JFK's conflict with Ben-Gurion was a secret to both the Israeli public and the American public and remained so for more than 20 years at least and still remains so, despite the release of Hersh's book, followed by Final Judgment and then the book by Avner Cohen.

Avner Cohen's very powerful book essentially confirmed everything that Hersh had written but went even further.

Cohen described how the conflict between JFK and Ben-Gurion reached its pinnacle in 1963 and how, on June 16 of that year, JFK sent a letter to the Israeli leader that Cohen says was "the toughest and most explicit message" yet. Cohen added: "Kennedy exerted the most useful leverage available to an American president in dealing with Israel: a threat that an unsatisfactory solution would jeopardize the U.S. government's commitment to, and support of, Israel..."

Ben-Gurion never read JFK's letter. Instead, Ben-Gurion announced his resignation. Cohen said that Ben-Gurion never provided an explanation for his decision, except in reference to "personal reasons." To his cabinet colleagues Ben-Gurion said that he "must" resign and that "no state problem or event caused it." Cohen added that Ben-Gurion had "concluded that he could not tell the truth about Dimona to American leaders, not even in private."

Immediately upon Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's resignation, JFK wrote a letter to the new prime minister. Levi Eshkol, that was evidently even more fierce than JFK's previous harsh communications with Ben-Gurion.Avner Cohen wrote:

> Not since Eisenhower's message to Ben-Gurion in the midst of the Suez crisis in November 1956 had an American president been so blunt with an Israeli prime minister. Kennedy told Eshkol that the U.S. commitment and support of Israel "could be seriously jeopardized" if Israel did not let the United States obtain "reliable information" about its efforts in the nuclear field. Kennedy's demands were unprecedented. They amounted, in effect, to an ultimatum.

Cohen noted that: "From [Eshkol's] perspective, Kennedy's demands seemed diplomatically inappropriate; they were inconsistent with national sovereignty. There was no legal basis or political precedent for such demands," Cohen says "Kennedy's letter precipitated a near-crisis situation in the prime minister's office."

So, contrary to what some might suggest today, Kennedy's pressure on Israel did not end with the resignation of Ben-Gurion. Instead, JFK's pressure on Israel over its nuclear ambitions clearly intensified. JFK would have no part of a nuclear-armed Israel in any way, shape or form.

The Israeli newspaper, Ha'aretz, published a review of Cohen's book on February 5, 1999, calling it "a bombshell of a book." The Ha'aretz review, by Reuven Pedatzur, is quite interesting. It reads in part:

> The murder of American President John F. Kennedy brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue the nuclear pro-gram. Cohen demonstrates at length the pressures applied by Kennedy on Ben-Gurion.
>
> He brings the fascinating exchange of letters between the two, in which Kennedy makes it quite clear to [Ben-Gurion] that he [JFK] will under no circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state.
>
> The book implied that, had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option.

According to historian Stephen Green: "Perhaps the most significant development of 1963 for the Israeli nuclear weapons program, however, occurred on November 22 on a plane flying from Dallas to Washington, D.C., Lyndon Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President of the United States, following the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Green elaborated further, in no uncertain terms::"In the early years of the Johnson administration the Israeli nuclear weapons program was referred to in Washington as the delicate topic.' Lyndon Johnson's White House saw no Dimona, heard no Dimona, and spoke no Dimona when the reactor went critical in early 1964."

Thus it was that the critical point of dispute between John F. Kennedy and the Mossad-dominated government of Israel was no longer an issue. The new American president—so long a partisan of Israel— allowed the nuclear program to continue. This was just the beginning.

Where does the more conventional thesis that the CIA was the prime mover behind the JFK assassination fit alongside the theory that the Mossad was also a key force in the JFK conspiracy?

By 1963 John F. Kennedy was not only at war with Israel and the crime syndicate dominated by Israeli loyalist Meyer Lansky and his Mafia henchmen, but JFK was also at war with their close ally in the international intelligence underworld—the CIA.

The CIA, of course, had its own problems with JFK. Just six weeks before John F. Kennedy was shot, The New York Times itself reported that a top Kennedy administration official had warned that a CIA-orchestrated coup in America was a fearful possibility. The CIA—like its allies in Israel—had good reason (in its own perception) to want to see JFK removed from the White House and replaced with Lyndon B.Johnson.

JFK's battle with the CIA over the Bay of Pigs debacle was just the beginning. JFK was—by the last days of his presidency—not only fighting the CIA's efforts to involve the United States ever more deeply in Southeast Asia, but he was also moving toward dismantling the CIA entirely. The CIA's very existence was in danger.

This, of course, has brought focus to the CIA as a likely suspect in the JFK assassination and it was a course of investigation followed by Jim Garrison.

However, there are other often-mentioned CIA connections to the assassination that also point toward the Mossad.

Note for example that a former mistress of Fidel Castro, CIA asset Marita Lorenz, testified to the U.S. Congress that longtime CIA operative Frank Sturgis, famous as an anti-Castro activist, told her after the assassination that he had been involved in the JFK assassination.

Based on his own extensive study of the JFK assassination Cuba's

former chief of counterintelligence, General Fabian Escalante Escalante, told journalist Claudia Furiati that Cuban intelligence had determined that, in fact, "Sturgis was in charge of communications—receiving and transmitting information on the movement at Dealey Plaza and the motorcade to the shooters and others."

If Sturgis was involved in the actual mechanics of the assassination, the historical evidence suggests that Sturgis could have been functioning as a knowing Mossad tool in the conspiracy.

The truth is that going back some fifteen years prior to the JFK assassination, Sturgis had worked for the Mossad.

According to JFK assassination researcher F Peter Model, Sturgis was a "Hagannah mercenary during the first (1948) Israeli-Arab war," and Sturgis also had a girlfriend in Europe in the 1950s who worked for Israeli intelligence and with whom he worked. Sturgis himself said that he assisted his girlfriend as a courier in Europe in a number of her endeavors on behalf of the Mossad.

According to the late Andrew St. George, a former Time-Life correspondent who spent much time in Cuba during and after Castro's revolution, it was also well known among anti-Castro Cuban exiles that Sturgis had also worked for the Mossad and had done so for a long period of time.

In addition, during the heyday of the CIA's anti-Castro operations in Miami in which Sturgis was a key figure, some 12 to 16 Mossad agents worked out of Miami under the command of Mossad Deputy Director Yehuda S. Sipper, their influence reaching throughout Latin America and the Caribbean.

Citing a 1976 CIA memo, Professor John Newman who has investigated CIA knowledge of Lee Harvey Oswald's activities, says that Sturgis founded the International Anti-Communist Brigade and that "the backers of Sturgis' group have never been fully established."

Information outlined by a number of sources suggests that Sturgis' group could have been an off-shoot of the Mossad's Miami-based operations, intertwined with Sturgis' own CIA-sponsored intrigue in the same sphere of influence.

In fact, a unit of Sturgis' Brigade was CIA contract agent Gerry Patrick Hemming's so-called "Interpen" that operated outside New Orleans and Sturgis was connected with those Interpen operations.

Those activities around New Orleans are known to have involved two of the key players surrounding Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the JFK assassination: CIA contract agents Guy Banister and David Ferrie (both of whom were investigated by Jim Garrison and both of whom Garrison linked to Clay Shaw in activities involving intelligence intrigue.)

In fact, there is an Israeli connection to Interpen. According to Hemming himself, Interpen's "most important contact in the United States" was New York financier, Theodore Racoosin, whom Hemming described as "one of the key founders of the state of Israel."

Hemming frankly says that although he personally has seen no evidence that convinces him the Mossad participated directly in the JFK assassination, he has said that "I have known since the late 1960s that the Mossad was aware of the JFK murder even before it happened, and they later did a full investigation on the matter and have since retained all such files." [Emphasis added.]

In any case, we not only find CIA asset Clay Shaw of New Orleans tied to the Mossad through his association with the Permindex operation (as were Banister and Ferrie), but we also find two other CIA-connected players in the anti-Castro operations out of New Orleans (Sturgis and Hemming) were in the Mossad's sphere of influence. And Lee Harvey Oswald is tied to all of the key players involved.

In any event, we now do know that at least one person who has reportedly confessed to actual involvement in the JFK assassination—Frank Sturgis—did have multiple longtime links to the Mossad for many years prior to (and after) the time of the JFK assassination. And so it goes. There's much more to the story. But let us close with this:

Some years ago, an American gentleman met famed CBS newsman Walter Cronkite at Martha's Vineyard. He apprised Cronkite of the theory of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination and Cronkite listened carefully. Cronkite's response was intriguing, to say the least.

Looking out to sea, Cronkite remarked quite succinctly: "I can't think of any group—with the exception of Israeli intelligence—that would have been able to keep the JFK assassination conspiracy under wraps for so long."

The evidence demonstrates that there is a very strong foundation for the thesis. It is a scenario that does make sense, much to the dismay of many critics. The scenario comes closer than anything yet written in summarizing the entirety of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

This admittedly "unusual "and certainly controversial reconstruction of the JFK assassination conspiracy takes a new look at a very big jigsaw puzzle that displays a remarkably complex and somewhat murky picture.On the immensely confusing picture on the front of the puzzle are all of the various groups and individuals implicated in the JFK assassination conspiracy. However, when one turns the puzzle over, there is a large and very clear picture of the Israeli flag to be found.

Chapter Thirteen

Jimmy Carter's "Jewish Problem": The Not-So-Secret Long-Time War Aganst Jimmy Carter by Israel and its Powerful Lobby in Washington

John F. Kennedy was not the only American president to face the wrath of the Israeli lobby in America. As president, and in the years following his four years in the White House (particularly in recent times), JFK's fellow Democrat, Jimmy Carter, has also been a target of Israel and its powerful advocates on American soil. And now, the Israeli lobby is mad at Jimmy Carter—yet again. The former president—a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize—is under fire from the Israeli lobby for comments he made in a new book focusing on the Palestine problem.

The title of Carter's book alone inflamed friends of Israel. Carter's use of the term "apartheid" in the title Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid effectively compares Israel's ongoing treatment of the Christian and Muslim Palestinian Arabs to the former policy of racial separation (known as "apartheid") in South Africa, long since dismantled.

And as anyone who has followed the mass media at any given time during the last 50 years knows full well, the concept of "apartheid" has never had a favorable review. So Carter's use of the term to describe Israel's policies is a pointed one and it sparked heated frenzy in pro-Israel circles.

In his book, the ex-president also pointed a finger at the influence of the Israeli lobby, saying,"Because of powerful political, economic, and religious forces in the United States, Israeli government decisions are rarely questioned or condemned."This comment alone was angrily condemned by Zionist voices as reflecting an old-fashioned "anti-Semitic-conspiracy theory."

Carter also riled supporters of Israel by suggesting that "Israel's continued control and colonization of Palestinian land have been the primary obstacles to a comprehensive peace agreement in the Holy Land."

Speaking on behalf of a high-level clique of Democratic Party fundraisers focus on generating Jewish campaign contributions to the party's coffers, U.S. Congressman Steven J. Israel, a glib New Yorker with presidential aspirations, denounced Carter, attacked the Palestinians and added that the Nobel Peace Prize winner's concerns don't reflect the direction of the Democratic Party. "It reflects the opinion of one man," asserted Israel.

This is not the first time that the former president has come under fire for his criticisms of Israel. Following the most recent Israeli assault on Lebanon, Carter upset Israel's partisans when he said, "I don't think Israel has any legal or moral justification for their massive bombing of the entire nation of Lebanon."

But the truth is that Carter's problems with Israel and its American lobby go back to virtually the earliest days of his presidency—a point that many Americans have never really understood. In fact, as far back as March 2, 1978, little more than a year after Carter was sworn in as president, The Wall Street Journal was already noting that even though Carter had just won 75% of the Jewish vote in the presidential election, "various events and occurrences" in Carter's administration had "disturbed Jews." The Journal pointed out that many key leaders in the American Jewish community were "rethinking their commitment to Jimmy Carter" and that some were even "talk[ing] privately about a betrayal' [of Israel by Carter]." The article in the Journal was titled, quite directly, "Jimmy Carter's Jewish Problem."

The American Zionists were disturbed that Carter had put pressure on Israel to stop colonizing occupied Arab territories and had made the decision to sell advanced warplanes to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Carter had also dared to use the term "homeland" in reference to Palestinian aspirations—something that, in those days (and even still)—was considered a major offense to Israel's geopolitical demands upon the world.

Citing the harsh words about Carter by several top Jewish Democrats, the Journal said that this criticism "could mean a great deal," pointing out that San Francisco developer Walter Shorenstein, one of the Democratic Party's major fundraisers—and a well-known supporter of Israel—had gone so far as to ask:"Is Israel being sold down the river by [the Carter] administration?"

These questions were being raised as early as 1978, as noted, and by the spring of 1980, when Carter was seeking renomination and re-election, the war against Carter by Israel and its partisans was well under way. Things were so bad, from Carter's perspective, that—according to veteran journalists Andrew and Leslie Cockburn—Carter was heard to tell senior political advisors in a private meeting in the family quarters of the White House that "If I get back in, I'm going to fuck the Jews."

According to the Cockburns, writing in a little-noticed passage in their 1991 book, Dangerous Liaison: The Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Relationship, Carter's anger at Israel and its American supporters stemmed not only from increasing attacks on Carter from that corner, but, in particular, from the fact that Carter had discovered—through intercepts made available to him by the National Security Agency—that Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin was interfering in American domestic political affairs. Begin had been overheard advising New York Mayor Ed Koch on how to undermine Carter's reelection hopes.

In fact, Koch later went on to endorse Carter's Republican challenger, former California Gov. Ronald Reagan, whose own early rise in

both the entertainment industry (and later the political arena) came as a consequence of his close relationship with financial forces and organized crime interests who were prime movers behind the Israeli lobby in America. For more on Reagan's little-known criminal Zionist connections—something not discussed in the mass media—see the shocking new book, Supermob, by investigative journalist Gus Russo.

In addition, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—who became a key advisor to the Reagan campaign (and later the Reagan White House, just as he advises George W. Bush today)—was huddling with the Israeli ambassador to the United States, urging Israel to "organize forces in the U.S. and Israel" against Carter.

In the end, with Israeli lobby forces and financial contributors coalescing at the highest levels around Reagan, Carter was dislodged from the White House. Since then, Carter has won many accolades for his frank talk about the Middle East, defying the mass media and the Israeli lobby in the process.

As a consequence of his forthright criticisms of Israel, Carter has even been branded a "Holocaust denier."Yes, that's the formal word from a professor of religion touted by the mass media as the world's leading authority on "who's a Holocaust denier and who isn't." No less than Deborah Lipstadt—a hard-looking, mean-tongued agitator ensconced at Emory University in Georgia—announced in a commentary in the Jan. 20, 2007 issue of The Washington Post that the former president was guilty of Holocaust denial.

Let it be noted, though, that Lipstadt didn't say directly that "Jimmy Carter is a Holocaust denier," but she did accuse him, in her specific words, of "almost ignoring the Holocaust," and noted that this was "minimalization of the Holocaust," which, she asserted, "gives inadvertent comfort to those who deny its importance or even its historical reality, in part because it helps them deny Israel's right to exist."

In fact, the most cursory review of Lipstadt's book, Denying the Holocaust—in which she defines "Holocaust denial"—indicates that, in Lipstadt's definition, "minimalizing the Holocaust" is indeed a key facet of Holocaust denial. So Lipstadt was saying that Carter was indeed a "Holocaust denier."

The record shows that Lipstadt not only includes questioning the numbers of Jews who died in World War II to be a form of "Holocaust denial," but she also even includes questioning whether Germany bore primary guilt for instigating World War I—that's the first world war, not World War II—to be a form of denying the Holocaust. Now Carter has been thrown in the briar patch for his literary indiscretion of not having given the Holocaust the recognition Lipstadt claims it is due.

Lipstadt—like many in the leadership of the organized Jewish groups in America—was angry about Carter's aforementioned book, Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid, and in her commentary in the The Washington Post, Lipstadt let loose with her rantings against Carter.

Among other things, Lipstadt alleged that Carter "has relied on anti-Semitic stereotypes in defense" of his book and in his responses to his critics and that Carter had "repeatedly fallen back on traditional anti-Semitic canards." Lipstadt noted that Carter "reflexively fell back on this kind of innuendo about Jewish control of the media and government," although, Lipstadt added gratuitously, as if to sound "objective," that perhaps it was "inadvertent" on the part of the former president.

Before Lipstadt added her two cents, Carter had (as we have seen) already been repeatedly tarred as an "anti-Semite" who was promoting "anti-Jewish conspiracy theories," but it was Lipstadt who introduced the "H" word into the angry frenzy over Carter's book, which—despite the opposition, or perhaps precisely because of it—ended up on The New York Times best-seller list for weeks.

Lipstadt was not the only big name hitting Carter.Abe Foxman, chief of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith—the powerful lobby for Israel and a de facto arm of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad—slammed what he called Carter's "anti-Israel bias."

The ADL published full-page advertisements accusing Carter of "propagating myths about Jewish power." Foxman said that it is "particularly disturbing and dangerous that someone like Jimmy Carter" is contributing to an atmosphere in which, Foxman contended, "anti-Jewish conspiracy theories" were rampant. Carter's remarks, in defense of his book from attacks by Jewish organizations, according to Foxman, were "playing with fire."

Amazingly, despite Carter's efforts to assure the Jewish community that he was not a Jew-hater, including a public address at Brandeis University where he said that he had erred in using language in his book suggesting that he believed the Palestinians were justified in using terrorism to strike back at Israel for its misdeeds, the Jewish Telegraph Agency reported to Jewish readers all across America and around the world that Carter "did little to assuage many of the critics."

To add insult to injury, high-powered international political consultant Jennifer Laszlo Mizrahi—founder of the Israel Project and a longtime figure in the Zionist Organization of America—published a blistering attack on Carter saying that he practiced "reverse discrimination" because he favors the darker-skinned Christian and Muslim Palestinians over the "light-skinned" Jews of Israel. Mizrahi even complained that Carter had supported—as she described him—"the dark-skinned

President Hugo Chavez"—for president of Venezuela over "a better-qualified and more experienced light-skinned candidate."

According to this Zionist spokeswoman—who has been hailed by Forward, a distinguished Jewish newspaper, as one of the 50 most powerful Jewish Americans—Carter was supposedly practicing this "reverse discrimination," as a way to " [purge] himself before his God from the racist sins of his youth."

The very idea that a Zionist leader would accuse Carter of anti-white racism demonstrates how hysterical Carter's critics have become. And the truth is that the ranks of eminent Jewish Americans who have added Carter to their enemies list continues to grow day by day.

The irony is that Carter's book is hardly the anti-Semitic screed those critics suggest. If anything, Carter is only saying what he has been saying—and what millions upon millions of well-meaning people have been saying—for years: that Israel should stop oppressing and discriminating against the Muslim and Christian Palestinians and that Israel should return to its official pre-1967 borders. And that is hardly calling for Israel to be wiped off the map, as many of Carter's critics are implicitly suggesting he advocates.

That a former United States president—who remains highly regarded internationally and who is admired by many Americans for his candor—is now speaking out so forcefully regarding Israel's misdeeds (and of its malign influence, through its American lobby, on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy making) is a positive development indeed.

However—like JFK before him—Jimmy Carter faces strong opposition. And it is worth noting, too, for the historical record, that yet another Democratic president (no less than Bill Clinton) very clearly ran afoul of Israel during his presidency. In the chapter which follows we will examine Bill Clinton's own "secret war with Israel."

Chapter Fourteen

Did Bill Clinton "Turn His Back" on Israel? The Zionist Intrigues Behind "Monica-Gate"

Even former President Bill Clinton—who is generally perceived to be wildly popular in the American Jewish community—managed to get himself in trouble with America's organized Jewish groups over the issue of Israel's nuclear weapons program.

It didn't make national headlines, but Clinton's contretemps with the Jewish community was very much a subject of discussion in the higher circles of the Jewish establishment in the spring of 1999. This came not long after Clinton was acquitted by the Senate on perjury and obstruction of justice charges stemming from the now-infamous scandal involving Clinton's amorous adventures with famed "Jewish American Princess" Monica Lewinsky.

And, as we shall see, a careful review of the circumstances surrounding La'Affaire Lewinsky strongly suggests that the scandal was orchestrated by hard-line pro-Israel elements in the United States, working directly in conjunction with their like-minded allies in Israel.

There was much more to the Lewinsky scandal than most realize, and in this chapter we will examine that affair in a way that it has never been outlined before.

But first, let's take a brief look at Bill Clinton's run-in with Israel over its nuclear weapons program.

On May 14, 1999, the influential New York-based Jewish weekly, Forward, published an article expressing outrage and concern that "President Clinton is raising for the first time public concerns about Israel's nuclear program."

The article pointed out that some 35 members of the U.S. Congress had written a letter to Clinton expressing concerns about imprisoned Israeli nuclear engineer Mordechai Vanunu who was the first to publicly expose—first-hand—Israel's nuclear bomb production program.

Responding in a letter dated April 22, 1999 to Rep. Lynn Rivers CD-Mich.), President Clinton did more than just express his own concerns about Vanunu's plight. And this is what particularly distressed Israel and its partisans: Clinton also said that "I . . . share your concerns about the Israeli nuclear program. We have repeatedly urged Israel and other nonparties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to adhere to the Treaty and accept comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards."

Forward reported: "Jewish leaders reacted with shock at news that Mr. Clinton had weighed in on Mr. Vanunu and Israel's nuclear program," and cited the reaction of Anti-Defamation League director Abe Foxman who attacked Clinton, saying: "I can't believe the president would send such a letter. These are very sensitive issues. It is so judgmental."

However, Foxman's disgust with President Clinton was not singular. Malcolm Hoenlein, executive vice president of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, declared: "The president's reference to Israel's nuclear program is surprising and disturbing—as far as we know it's unprecedented."

That Clinton dared to follow in the path of his lifelong hero, John F. Kennedy, and challenge Israel on the issue of its nuclear Golem—rather even go further than JFK and publicly talk about Israel's atomic arsenal is remarkable indeed. But since Clinton had already survived the attempt to remove him from office, the president obviously had the proverbial "wiggle room" to be able to take his stand.

Despite the common (and quite inaccurate) perception—particularly by Clinton's many "conservative" critics—that somehow the "liberal media" lionized Clinton during his presidency, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the truth is that throughout his presidency, Clinton was very much under fire from the mass media in America.

The record demonstrates that it was that very media—which all honest persons acknowledge is controlled by Jewish families and financial networks sympathetic to the interests of Israel, claims to the contrary notwithstanding—which played such a large part in provoking public knowledge and discussion of the Lewinsky scandal in particular.

The January 4, 1999 issue of The Nation featured a revealing article by Michael Tomasky which examined this phenomenon in quite revealing detail. Tomasky pointed out that it was actually The New York Times—the flagship "liberal" newspaper—which is also, not incidentally, the premier pro-Israel journal in America—which played a substantial part in leaking many embarrassing and damaging revelations from the long-running investigation of President Clinton and First Lady Hillary Clinton by Special Prosecutor Ken Starr. Tomasky wrote: "At every crucial turn and pivot, the Times' editorial page has marched in lockstep with the prosecutor and his cheering section."

"Why is this worth remarking on?" asked Tomasky. Because, he pointed out, "on national matters, [the Times' editorial] page serves as more of an ideological Baedeker, instructing the country's elite as to what constitutes responsible liberal opinion."

In other words, The New York Times—voice of the pro-Israel elite—was telling its readers that it was "okay" to support Ken Starr's maneuvering against President Clinton.And so the question, then, was why one of America's most liberal presidents would be the target of the editorial wrath of the very liberal New York Times.

Obviously, it was because Bill Clinton was perceived to be insufficiently supportive of the demands of Israel.

When, during the frenzy over her husbands shenanigans, Hillary Clinton propounded the theory that there was a "right-wing conspiracy" to destroy her husband, Mrs. Clinton was correct.

However, Mrs. Clinton failed to mention whose "right-wing" was behind that conspiracy or how the "Monica-gate" scandal was used to manipulate U.S. Middle East policy.

Hillary Clinton's argument that a "right wing conspiracy" in America was behind the sex-and-perjury scandal that threatened to topple her husband had one big flaw, and it was a point that we already noted:After all, it was the major media in America—led by The Washington Post and Newsweek, joined by The New York Times and Time magazine-, along with the major networks, that were hyping the scandal and suggesting that it might be Bill Clinton's undoing.

Newsweek itself enlisted longtime Clinton confidant George Stephanapolous to write of Clinton's "betrayal" and young Stephanapolous, who had moved on to become an ABC commentator, even went on the air to bring up the possibilities of Clinton's resignation and/or impeachment.

And nobody had ever accused any of those major media voices of being a voice for the "right wing"—or the "right wing" in America, at least. However, the first lady clearly put her finger on something when she claimed that a "right wing conspiracy" was energizing the "Monica-gate" scandal. In fact, digging deep enough, one could find that the conspiracy of which Mrs. Clinton spoke reached all the way to the hardline "right wing" in Israel.

It was no coincidence that—just as the American supporters of Israel's right wing (the Likud bloc) were launching a major (and bitter) public relations campaign against President Clinton—the pro-Israel mass media in America picked up the lead and suddenly began trumpeting the allegations about yet another Clinton "sexcapade."

Let's look at some basic facts (reported in the major media itself) that somehow got buried in the midst of all the frenzy over the Lewinsky affair.

First of all, although the media focused on former White House staffer Linda Tripp and her brassy New York promoter friend, Lucianne Goldberg, as being the prime instigators of "Monica-gate," The Washington Post pointed out rather circuitously in a story buried at the back of the paper on January 28, 1998 that lawyers for Paula Jones "first received several anonymous tips that Lewinsky may have had a sexual relationship with the president."

(Miss Jones was the young lady who had sued President Clinton for sexual harassment stemming from the time that he was governor of

Arkansas and she was a state employee. It was during a deposition in that case that President Clinton lied under oath and denied that he had engaged in a sexual relationship with Monica Lewinsky.)

It apparently wasn't apparently until after this that lawyers for Paula Jones contacted Miss Lewinsky, tipping off the president that his (then-publicly-unknown) relationship with Lewinsky had been exposed.

At this juncture, it seems apparent neither the aforementioned Tripp nor Goldberg were the sources, inasmuch as they had other interests to exploit in the Clinton-Lewinsky caper. In fact, Tripp instead went directly to Special Prosecutor Kenneth Starr.

Therefore, the big question was this: who tipped off the lawyers for Paula Jones that there might be a "smoking gun" in the president's relationship with Monica Lewinsky?

Monica Lewinsky had been a Clinton loyalist and it was certainly not Miss Lewinsky who leaked the story to the lawyers. So someone close to—or spying on—the president's inner circle had to have leaked the word about the president's relationship with Miss Lewinsky (however innocent or not so innocent) to Jones's attorneys.

But let's go further. Although Michael Isikoff of Newsweek (published by the Meyer-Graham empire, which also owns The Washington Post) was the first journalist officially "digging into" the story, it now turns out that, according to the Post, reporting in passing on January 28, 1998 that one William Kristol—described generally as "editor of the conservative Weekly Standard"—as having been one of the first to "publicly mention" the allegations.

Kristol's role as being one of the "first" to float the story publicly, you see, is critical to understanding the big picture.

Not only is Kristol the front man for billionaire media tycoon Rupert Murdoch—a major ally of Israel's hard-line Likud—but Kristol himself is the son of journalist Irving Kristol and historian Gertrude Himmelfarb, two self-styled "former Marxists" who have emerged as "neoconservative" figures with long-standing close ties to Israel's "anti-communist right wing."

Young Kristol, a "Likudnik" like his parents, and was a harsh critic of what was being called Clinton's decision to "turn his back" on Israel. In fact, the theme that Clinton had "turned his back on Israel" was precisely the specific rhetorical focus of a wide-ranging heavy-handed advertising campaign by Likud supporters in the United States in the immediate weeks before the Lewinsky scandal erupted.

The record shows that at least six days before the first news of the Lewinsky scandal began breaking in the broadcast media at midnight on Tuesday, January 20, 1998, an advertisement appeared in the January 15

edition of the respected Washington Jewish Week newspaper accusing President Clinton of having "turned his back on Israel."

What made the advertisement so striking was that it used a rear view of President Clinton (first captured on video in 1996) that had never been published but which, in the wake of the Lewinsky scandal, became very familiar. It was a view of the president, his back to the camera, clearly taken from the video in which he was seen hugging the soon-to-be infamous Miss Lewinsky when she was in a receiving line at the White House some two years before. Miss Lewinsky had known the existence of this video and bragged about it among her associates prior to the time that the scandal broke.

So clearly, Clinton's critics among the pro-Netanyahu forces in the United States—who sponsored the advertisement—were already tuned in to the fact of the Lewinsky-Clinton liaison and, more significantly, of the fact that it was soon to be unleashed upon the president.

That it was one of Netanyahu's key American partisans, the aforementioned William Kristol, who was first to announce the impending scandal is clearly no coincidence.

At the time, this author (Michael Collins Piper) published the story of the evidence of the Likudnik role in the Lewinsky scandal in the February 2, 1998 issue of The Spotlight newspaper, reproducing the "rear view" of Clinton from the videotape (as published in newspapers all across the United States) side-by-side with the same rear image as utilized in the Likudnik propaganda campaign against the president.

This particular Spotlight story came as a follow-up to an earlier story by this author in that same newspaper's issue of February 9, 1998, outlining the other previous indications of Israeli-Likudnik orchestration of the scandal.

Shortly after the publication of these stories that critics accused of being "conspiracy mongering," a friend of the author—who also just happened to be an old Arkansas friend of President and Mrs. Clinton—passed on the Spotlight stories to persons whom he described as "my friends" and then told the author: "I think you're right. And my friends think you're right. But we've never had this conversation."

So, in many respects, one might say that the Lewinsky affair was "made in Israel"—probably in the office of then-Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu himself.

It was thus no coincidence that on January 26, 1998, just as the Lewinsky affair began escalating and engulfing Clinton, American Likudnik William Kristol released a letter to Clinton, pressuring the president to launch a military attack on Israel's hated enemy, Iraq.

Signing the letter along with Kristol were a bevy of other famed

American supporters of Israel's "right wing" including former Rep. Vin Weber, a longtime close ally of then-House Speaker Newt Gingrich, and Richard Perle, a former deputy secretary of defense who was then a highly-paid consultant for Israeli arms interests (and, during the later George W. Bush administration, head of the Defense Policy Board, from which post he promoted the U.S. war against Iraq).

Then, in light of the Kristol-Murdoch connection, it is critical to note that Murdoch's Fox television led the stampedge in the Establishment media against Clinton, forcing the other networks to compete in the rush for the latest "news" on the Lewinsky affair.

The Fox News Channel carried the story almost non-stop around the clock. Even when other features were telecast, they were subject to interruption for any breaking developments in the scandal, regardless of how mundane they were. Fox even brought in a reported specialist in "body language" to view the video of Clinton and Lewinsky on the receiving line, after which the "specialist" declared Clinton was treating the girl as though she were "the first lady."

Not surprisingly, in addition, some of the most tawdry stories to break in the burgeoning scandal were in The New York Post, along with other Murdoch-owned news publications.

At a town hall meeting in Charlotte, North Carolina, House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), a strong supporter of the Netanyahu regime in Israel, received an enthusiastic response from the mostly-Republican crowd when he called the president's treatment of the Israeli prime minister "below the dignity of America."

Gingrich was referring to Clinton's efforts to get the Israeli leader to take a more conciliatory view toward achieving a peace settlement in the Middle East.

In the meantime, in her effort to once again "stand by her man," the first lady named television preacher Jerry Falwell and his friend, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), as among those who were part of the "right wing conspiracy" that was out to "get" her president.

What Hillary didn't mention was that both Falwell and Helms were especially close to—once again—the hard-line "right wing" Likud bloc in Israel and both were adamantly opposed to President Clinton's perceived support for Likud's rivals in Israel's Labor Party which had been far more amenable to the peace process.

Having more or less openly supported Netanyahu's rival, Shimon Peres, in the recent Israeli elections, Clinton was embarrassed politically when Netanyahu won. And Netanyahu's American supporters were doing everything within their power to damage Clinton's presidency in return. The Lewinsky affair became a vital political tool in their effort.

And note that even prior to his official meeting with President Clinton, the Israeli prime minister had already met with (and appeared at a pro-Likud rally in the company of) the aforementioned Jerry Falwell, one of Clinton's most vociferous critics.

Even The Washington Post revealed on January 22, 1998 that "a senior Netanyahu official had said the Israeli leader was prepared to respond to opposition from the White House by demonstrating his 'own ammunition' in U.S. political circles"—namely Falwell and the boisterous pro-Zionist "Christian Right."

In Israeli itself, according to the Post on January 24, 1998, the press had "lapped up the Clinton allegations." The Post said that "interest seemed particularly sharp because Monica Lewinsky is Jewish."

Writing in the January 22, 1998 issue of the Israeli daily Yedioth Aharonoth, Nahum Barnea wryly commented: "We innocently thought the fate of the peace process was in the hands of a Jewess, born in Prague, named Madeleine Albright [referring to the American Secretary of State who was of Jewish origin]. Apparently, the fate of the peace process is, to no lesser degree, in the hands of another Jewess, named Monica Lewinsky, 24 years old, a Beverly Hills native, who spent a fun-filled summer three years ago as an [intern] at the White House."

What was interesting is that by the time Barnea's comments were repeated in the February 2, 1998 issue of Newsweek, which devoted a special issue to the scandal, Newsweek had carefully edited Barnea's words so that they now read: "It turns out that the fate of the peace process depends on a different woman." The Jewish angle to the Lewinsky affair had thus been utterly erased.

In fact, the Lewinsky scandal forced the president into retreat as far as pushing Israel was concerned—much to the delight of Israel's Likud.

On January 27, 1998 The Washington Post again let the cat out of the bag when it reported that "last week, Clinton demonstrated he could not compel the Israelis to meet their responsibilities for a further military pullback. This week [in the wake of the scandal] he is even less capable, if only because people in his own party, not to mention the Republicans, will not support a policy of greater pressure on Israel."

Should there be any doubt that Bill and Hillary Clinton were certainly aware that the Lewinsky affair was being promoted by Israel's Likudniks and their American allies in the "right wing" conspiracy that Hillary had alluded to, bear in mind that at the height of the Lewinsky frenzy the First Lady publicly called for the creation of a Palestinian state.This was a clear shot over Israel's bow. The First Lady was, as a consequence, thrashed relentlessly by Israel's partisans, but there's no question that this was an obvious and calculated provocation by Hillary (and

certainly her husband) meant to show her husband's enemies that the Clintons could play hardball with Israel and its American friends if necessary Although the Clinton administration itself formally distanced itself from Hillary's remarks, the point had been made.

Ultimately—some seven years later, in December of 2005—the truth about the very real Israeli role in utilizing the Lewinsky affair to put pressure on President Clinton emerged.

Television evangelist Jerry Falwell couldn't resist bragging and finally admitting the truth: he and former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin "Bibi" Netanyahu did conspire—at a critical time—to trip up President Clinton and specifically use the pressure of the Monica Lewinsky sex scandal to force Clinton to abandon pressure on Israel to withdraw from the occupied West Bank.

Falwell's confession didn't make national news—as it should have. Instead, the preacher's confession came buried in a lengthy story in the December 2005 issue of Vanity Fair. Entitled "American Rapture" the article (by Craig Unger) described the long-standing and still-flourishing love affair between American dispensationalist evangelicals such as Falwell and the hardline Jewish extremist forces in Israel then under the leadership of Binyamin "Bibi" Netanyahu.

The admission by Falwell confirmed precisely what this author first revealed in The Spotlight in 1998 and later recounted in a lecture before the Arab League's official think tank, the Zayed Centre in Abu Dhabi, in March of 2003.

Although, following my lecture at the Zayed Centre, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, a lobby for Israel, denounced as a "bizarre conspiracy theory" my charge that "Monica-gate" did indeed have Israeli origins, the assertion by Falwell that the public unveiling of the Lewinsky affair forced Clinton to pull back on pressuring Israel confirmed exactly what I had charged.

Regarding Falwell's recounting of how he worked with Netanyahu in undermining Clinton's pressure on Israel, Vanity Fair reported:

> On a visit to Washington, D.C. in 1998, Netanyahu hooked up with Jerry Falwell at the Mayflower Hotel the night before [Netanyahu's] scheduled meeting with Clinton. "I put together 1,000 people or so to meet with Bibi [Netanyahu] and he spoke to us that night," recalls Falwell. "It was all planned by Netanyahu as an affront to Mr. Clinton."...
>
> The next day, Netanyahu met with Clinton at the White House. "Bibi told me later," Falwell recalls, "that

> the next morning Bill Clinton said, I know where you were last night." The pressure was really on Netanyahu to give away the farm in Israel.
>
> It was during the Monica Lewinsky scandal Clinton had to save himself, so he terminated the demands [to relinquish West Bank territory] that would have been forthcoming during that meeting, and would have been very bad for Israel."

What Falwell did not mention—at least as reported by Vanity Fair—is that his meeting with the Israeli leader took place on the very evening before the mass media in America broke open the Monica Lewinsky scandal with much fanfare.

Nor did Falwell mention—as this author pointed out at the time and as we've noted again here in these pages— was that one of Netanyahu's leading American publicists, neo-conservative power broker William Kristol, was the first American media figure to publicly hint (in the days before the scandal was officially unveiled) that there were forthcoming revelations regarding a White House sex scandal that was about to be unveiled to the detriment of William Jefferson Clinton.

The story of Bill Clinton's imbroglio with Israel is probably something Bill and Hillary Clinton would prefer be forgotten, but the lesson of Israel's success in using such a scandal as the Lewinsky affair to batter President Clinton is not something that Israel and its American lobby are likely to forget. Should Hillary Clinton somehow assume the presidency, she must be prepared to face the consequences.

Chapter Fifteen

Revolt of the Generals: America's Military Elite Take a Stand Against Israel's American Partisans

The good news for those who are concerned about the dangers of America's special relationship with the nuclear garrison state known as Israel is that many of America's top military figures—both publicly and privately—are taking a firm stand against the U.S-Israeli special relationship. Although none of the military men have yet said "No more wars for Israel," their rhetoric in writings and public utterances said essentially that. And coming in the wake of the report by the U.S. Army War College calling for an international inspection of Israel's nuclear Golem (referenced in a previous chapter in this volume), this is a postive development that could evolve into a serious political force in days ahead

Ironically, although for generations, Republicans were strong supporters of the American military, now that top military men are in open rebellion against the armchair civilian war hawks—the hard-line pro-Israel ideologues who directed President George Bush to order an invasion of Iraq and who now want war on Iran—the angriest voices condemning the military are from GOP circles.

Following the lead of the neo-conservatives, who are viewed as fanatics but who still dominate the Bush administration and key GOP think tanks and policy groups—as well as the advisory councils of all of the leading 2008 Republican presidential hopefuls—many Republican loyalists began declaring war on the battle-tested generals, admirals and other military heroes who are saying, "Enough is enough."

Conservatives roundly denounced former Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni as an "anti-Semite" for noting that pro-Israel neo-conservatives were the driving force behind the Iraq war and that everybody in Washington knew it. Zinni knew what he was talking about: he formerly commanded all U.S. forces protecting Israel in the Middle East.

Another retired Marine, Lt. Gen. Greg Newbold, former director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote in Time that the Iraq war was "unnecessary" and that the rationale for war by those whom he called "the zealots" made no sense. Newbold's choice of the word "zealots" was loaded.The term arises from the legend of the Zealots—an ancient sect of Jewish fanatics.

Newbold quit the service four months before the Iraq invasion, in part, he said, because he opposed those who exploited the 9-11 tragedy "to hijack our security policy"—referring to the zealous neo-con fanatics. He added: "Until now, I have resisted speaking out in public." But, he said, "I've been silent long enough."

What particularly disturbed Newbold's critics was that he said he was speaking out "with the encouragement of some still in positions of military leadership."

He also struck out at what he called "the distortion of intelligence in the buildup to the war"—a slam at the neo-conservatives and their Israeli allies who shoveled up garbage, disguised as "intelligence," and used it to justify the war.

Newbold brandished his anger at the civilian armchair war hawks—most of whom never served in the military (and most of whom are Jewish, although Newbold didn't mention that point), saying, "the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with a casualness and swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions—or bury the results."

Newbold's statements received much media attention, so the neo-conservative Zealots fired back.

Perhaps the most telling attack on the generals came from Stephen Herbits, a former top executive of the Seagram liquor empire, the fief-dom of World Jewish Congress chief Edgar Bronfman, a major patron of Israel. This longtime Bronfman henchman was appointed by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to make "heads roll" in the military, screening all Pentagon promotions and appointments, implementing the agenda of enforcing lockstep Zionist control of the American war machine.

Writing in the April 2, 2006 edition of the egregiously pro-Israel Washington Times, Herbits urged the media to start to investigate military leaders who dared to take on the administration. Herbits said it would be "a service to this country when the media digs a bit below these attacks to examine the generals."

Herbits was obviously calling on spy agencies such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), a conduit for Israel's Mossad, to come up with "data" on the military men and provide it to the media to bring the dissidents into line.

Incidentally, because Herbits was openly gay and a long-time public advocate for the cause of homosexual rights, there are those who believe that the very reason Herbits had been drafted by the Bush administration to institute so-called "reform" at the Pentagon was so that military figures who opposed Herbits' intrigues at the Pentagon on behalf of the Zionist apparatus would be less likely to criticize the Bronfman family henchman for fear of being accused of anti-gay bias in the event they did dare to challenge Herbits primary agenda: rooting out perceived enemies of Israel inside the American military elite.

And it is worth noting that after Herbits ultimately left the Bush administration, he returned to the Bronfman fold, taking on the post of

secretary-general of the World Jewish Congress, demonstrating where Herhits' primary political sympathies lie.

But cracking the whip over the entire military will be tough. On April 18, 2006, David Broder, senior Washington Post commentator, revealed that some months before, after he wrote of how Rep. Jack Murtha (D-Pa.)—a former Marine colonel who served in Vietnam—had called for U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, Broder was contacted by a Pentagon officer who gave his name and rank and then said:

"This is a private call. I am not speaking officially. But I read your column, and I think it is important for you to know that Jack Murtha knows us very well and speaks for many of us."

This was no secret to those who know official Washington since Murtha has been a leading Capitol Hill voice for the military for years. And this is what makes pro-Israel Republican attacks on Murtha so disingenuous: they paint Murtha as a "pacifist," "defeatist," "liberal" ideologue. He is anything but that, despite the loud claims by Israel's defenders who worked so assiduously to defame Murtha.

For its own part, in an April 18, 2006 editorial, titled "The Generals' Revolt," The Washington Post said "the rebellion is problematic" and "threatens the essential democratic principle of military subordination to civilian control—the more so because a couple of the officers claim they are speaking for some still on active duty."

That same day, a lead editor of The Washington Times, Tony Blankley—an advocate of all-out war against the Muslim world— declared that generals still in service who might be planning to quit together in protest against Bush policies may be "illegally conspiring."

Not content with accusing American military leaders of being seditious, Blankley followed up the next day with a repetition of his smears, calling for a court of inquiry to determine whether the military leaders were guilty of insubordination.

Echoing Blankley, shrill pro-Israel agitator Charles Krauthammer, a psychiatrist by profession, not a soldier, blustered on April 21, 2006 with a column in The Washington Post crying of "The General's Dangerous Whispers." This was no surprise to those familiar with the traditionally inflammatory rhetoric from the likes of Krauthammer.

In the end, though, what's most interesting is that prior to the explosion of reports in the mainstream media about the dissatisfied generals—four years after the Washington-based American Free Press first broke the story at a national level, even before the invasion of Iraq—the April 2006 issue of America's oldest and most respected magazine, Harper's, featured a provocative cover story: "American Coup d'Etat: Military thinkers discuss the unthinkable."

This was one month after Harper's—in another cover story—called for the impeachment of President Bush. Clearly, some people in high places were—and are—not happy with the pro-Israel internationalism (and war-mongering policies) of the Bush regime.

As recently as May 27,2007, writing in The Washington Post, another former military officer, retired Army Colonel Andrew Bacevich— a West Point graduate who served in Vietnam and who is now a professor of international relations at Boston University—restated his long-standing opposition to the war in Iraq. This came in a poignant commentary reflecting on the fact that his son had recently been killed in Iraq.

Noting that although the November 2006 elections "signified an unambiguous repudiation of the policies that landed us in our present predicament" Bacevich pointed out that although "the people have spoken ... nothing of substance has changed [and] half a year later, the war continues with no end in slight."

Instead, he said, "by sending more troops to Iraq (and by extending the tours of those, like my son, who were already there), Bush has signaled his complete disregard for what was once quaintly referred to as the will of the people.'"

But Bacevich also placed the blame for the ongoing war on the Democratic Party leadership who—during the month of May 2007—continued to effectively support the war, despite all of their partisan rhetoric in opposition to the war to the contrary. Bacevich wrote:

> To be fair, responsibility for the war's continuation now rests no less with the Democrats who control Congress than with the president and his party.
>
> After my son's death, my state's senators, Edward M. Kennedy and John F. Kerry, telephoned to express their condolences. Stephen F. Lynch, our congressman, attended my son's wake. Kerry was present for the funeral Mass.
>
> My family and I greatly appreciated such gestures. But when I suggested to each of them the necessity of ending the war, I got the brushoff. More accurately, after ever so briefly pretending to listen, each treated me to a convoluted explanation that said in essence: Don't blame me.
>
> To whom do Kennedy, Kerry and Lynch listen? We know the answer: to the same people who have the ear of George W Bush and Karl Rove—namely, wealthy individuals and institutions. [Emphasis added]

When Bacevich was making reference to 'wealthy individuals and institutions," there can be no doubt that Bacevich was referring to the people and institutions—wealthy all—that make up the powerful Israeli lobby in America. His further comments drove home that point further:

> Money buys access and influence. Money greases the process that will yield us a new president in 2008. When it comes to Iraq, money ensures that the concerns of big business, big oil, bellicose evangelicals and Middle East allies gain a hearing. [Emphasis added.]

When Bacevich clearly mentioned "bellicose evangelicals and Middle East allies," this was obviously a direct reference to Israel's heavy-handed Christian fundamentalist supporters in America and to Israel itself, since the only Middle East ally of the United States that favored American intervention in Iraq was Israel.

To drive home his point even more so regarding the domination of the American political system by all of these well-heeled interests, Bacevich added further:

> Money maintains the Republican/Democratic duopoly of trivialized politics. It confines the debate over U.S. policy to well-hewn channels. It preserves intact the cliches of 1933-45 about isolationism, appeasement and the nation's call to "global leadership." It inhibits any serious accounting of exactly how much our misadventure in Iraq is costing. It ignores completely the question of who actually pays. It negates democracy, rendering free speech little more than a means of recording dissent.

Quite cognizant of the fact that for having made such comments, he might well be accused of being a "conspiracy theorist," even an "anti-Semitic" one at that, Bacevich concluded succinctly: "This is not some great conspiracy. It's the way our system works."

Dr. Bacevich does not stand alone. His concerns are shared by many in the military and in other American institutions. That's why Israel and its partisans are much concerned. They realize there is growing opposition to Israel and its capacity to blackmail the United States through the threat of using its nuclear Golem and through the clout of its lobby in Washington. And that's why, as we shall see in the chapter which follows, Israel is now working to bring these dissident voices into line

Chapter Sixteen

The Great 21st Century "Witch" Hunt: Zionists Call for Expulsion of Israel's Critics From the U.S. Government and Military

A leading voice of the pro-Israel lobby is pushing for an old-style "witch-hunt"—under the ubiquitous propaganda guise of "homeland security"—to identify (and expel) individuals in the U.S. government and in the American military suspected of being hostile to Israel.

The Zionist call for a witch-hunt was based on the outlandish thesis that "Islamo-fascists" and Muslim "jihadist" operatives and, perhaps more particularly, their "sympathizers"—however loosely defined by the fear-mongers—have infested America's defense, national security and federal law enforcement community.

The witch-hunt was proposed in the fall 2006 issue of the small-circulation—but highly influential—Journal of International Security Affairs published by the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), one of the frontline forces in the fanatically pro-Israel "neo-con-servative" circles directing foreign policy under George W. Bush.

Not only Vice President Dick Cheney, but also UN Ambassador John Bolton, former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Douglas Feith and Richard Perle, former chairman of the Defense Policy Board—to name just a few big administration names—have all been JINSA associates.

One analyst, University of Pennsylvania Prof. Edward Herman, has correctly described JINSA as "organized and [run] by individuals closely tied to the Israeli lobby and can be regarded as a virtual agency of the Israeli government."

What first appears as commentary in JINSA's Journal often leads to very real policies carried out by the Bush administration alone and sometimes in concert with Capitol Hill, which some critics have been known to cynically call "Israeli occupied territory."

The JINSA call for a witch-hunt came in the context of a series of commentaries on "21st Century Allies ... and Adversaries" for the United States and Israel, which two nations, of course, are seen in the JINSA world view as virtual extensions of one another.

Zionist publications regularly assert that "anti-Israel" sentiments must automatically be seen as "anti-American" and even as "anti-Christian" in nature, a theme first loudly propagated by the American Jewish Committee's Commentary magazine.

The JINSA essays, not surprisingly, named such countries as Iran, Syria, Russia and Venezuela, as possible "adversaries" for the U.S.-Israel Axis. However, it was an essay by Walid Phares—who is associated with a Zionist public policy front known as the Foundation for the Defense of the Democracies—which made the suggestion that there are very

real "adversaries" on American soil, at high levels in the American military and intelligence establishment. In his article "Future Terrorism— Mutant Jihads," Phares asked:

> How deeply have jihadist elements infiltrated the U.S. government and federal agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, and various military commands, either through sympathizers or via actual operatives?

Although posed as a loaded question, Phares's implication was all too clear: he believes such a "threat" exists. The JINSA writer then proclaimed the need for a "national consensus" that requires "confronting these forces" based on "knowledge of their ideologies, objectives and determination."

Since there are few Muslim Americans or even Arab Americans in any substantial numbers in the FBI, Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, etc, the suggestion that "jihadist" elements have "infiltrated" our government might seem silly to the average American.

But in the fevered minds of JINSA and hard-line Zionist elements operating on American soil, determined to enforce Israel's demands on the American foreign policy establishment, the real concern is that there are growing numbers of people high up in the FBI and the CIA and in the military who are getting "fed up" with Zionist power in America.

Since top military leaders openly dismissed the need for war against Iraq and Iran, both wars of which have been long-time goals of the Zionist lobby, this, in the view of the JINSA sphere, constitutes effective collaboration with and sympathy for the dreaded "jihadists."

For example, on May 11, 2005, the New York-based Forward, a leading Jewish community newspaper, reported that Barry Jacobs of the Washington office of the American Jewish Committee said he believed there are high-ranking officials in the U.S. intelligence community who are hostile to Israel and waging war against pro-Israel lobbyists and their neo-conservative allies in the inner circles of the Bush administration.

Citing the ongoing FBI investigation of espionage by officials of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the leading pro-Israel lobby group, Forward reported that this top-level Jewish community leader believes, in Forward's summary, that "the notion that American Jews and Pentagon neo-conservatives conspired to push the United States into war against Iraq, and possibly also against Iran, is pervasive in Washington's intelligence community."

Obviously, with such thoughts running rampant in pro- Israel circles, it is inevitable a leading pro-Israel policy group such as JINSA would raise the specter of "infiltration" by those who are seen as "sympathizers" and suggest that they be purged from government agencies.

So the threat of a witch-hunt happening is real. Despite differences between the Bush administration and its Democratic foes, both come together in one realm: satisfying the Israeli lobby which funds both Democrats and Republicans alike through a network of political action committees and exercising its clout on Capitol Hill through pressure groups such as APIAC, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League.

It is ironic that JINSA should be the source of a demand for an investigation of foreign agents and sympathizers inside the American government. The founder of JINSA, Stephen Bryen, a former Senate aide on Capitol Hill, faced certain indictment on charges of espionage for Israel until pressure on the Justice Department forced Justice to back off.

Not only Bryen, but several others in the JINSA sphere had, at one time or another, been under FBI investigation on similar charges relating to their possible misuse of American defense and intelligence information on Israel's behalf. They include:

• Richard Perle, investigated in the 1970s when he was a top aide to then-Sen. Henry Jackson;

• Douglas Feith, who—although later promoted to a high post in the Bush administration in 2001—was fired from the National Security Council of President Ronald Reagan; and

• Paul Wolfowitz, recently deposed head of the World Bank and former deputy secretary of defense in the Bush administration, investigated in the 1970s by the FBI on suspicion of passing classified information to Israel.

That such obvious traitors should be given a pass, even as critics of Israel are now being subjected to threats of a witch hunt, says much about the course of American affairs today.

However, it is not just American military and intelligence figures who are raising concerns about the undue influence of Israel and its lobby on American policy-making. A growing number of academics— and some major ones at that—are now daring to speak out, much to the dismay of the witch hunters.These critics of Israel will not be silenced.

In our next chaper we will examine this growing phenomenon and the response it has generated from Israel's heavy-handed adherents operating in the United States today.

Chapter Seventeen

The Revolt of the Academics: Top Scholars Raise the Question: "Is the U.S.-Israel Special Relationship Good for America?"

In the spring of 2006, two of the most distinguished foreign policy specialists in the United States—John Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago and Stephen Walt of Harvard—released a paper, entitled "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy" that was highly critical of the U.S.-Israeli special relationship.

Although first launched on the Internet, a pared-down rendition appeared on March 23, 2006 in The London Review of Books. Ironically, although the report generated much controversy, the New York-based Jewish newspaper, Forward, noted quite correctly: "There's little that's new" in the report. In fact, anyone who had been reading the Washington-based American Free Press or who—going back to the 1960s and 1970s—read other publications like Liberty Letter or The Spotlight already knew what was being reported by the two academics.

Although America's major media always portrayed Israel in the fondest light, free thinkers worldwide had nonetheless raised uncomfortable questions that suggested the truth about Israel might be otherwise. Such critics of the U.S.-Israel axis were called "anti-Semites." Even South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who—until then—had always been an icon of the American press, shocked many in 2002 when he asserted that in the United States "the Israeli government is placed on a pedestal," because, Tutu said,"the Jewish lobby is powerful—very powerful."

With the release of their paper, Meirsheimer and Walt had finally stepped up to echo what critics of Israel had been saying for years.What was so disturbing to pro-Israel forces was that the academics, as Forward put it,"can't be dismissed as cranks outside the mainstream." As the Jewish weekly put it:"They are the mainstream."And that's why the Zionists were frightened.Walt had not only been a Harvard professor, but he was also the outgoing academic dean of the university's John F. Kennedy School of Government which Forward acknowledged is "the nation's most prestigious center of political studies."

In the wake of the firestorm in academic circles and in some media, copies of the paper flew across the globe via email. As a result, a lot of people who previously believed that criticism of Israel was the work of "haters" learned that two of the most respected American foreign affairs specialists were saying some tough things about the dangers resulting from the Israeli lobby's powerful influence on U.S. foreign policy.

On March 25, 2006 the fiercely pro-Israel "Editorial Board" column of The Wall Street Journal (WSJ) took the professors to task but accurately noted that:"[Their premise] is that Israel is a huge strategic liabil-

ity for the U.S. which wrecks our reputation in the Arab world, complicates our diplomacy at the UN, inspires Islamic fanaticism and terror, goads us into misbegotten wars and makes us complicit in Israeli human rights abuses, all the while costing some $3 billion a year."Although the WSJ asserted Mearsheimer and Walt were not necessarily "anti-Semitic," their paper was "anti-Semitic in effect."

Meanwhile, pro-Israel elements touted the claim by a Harvard Law school-based publicist for Israel, Alan Dershowitz, that the two largely relied on material on "neo-Nazi" and "anti-Semitic" web sites as sources. Dershowitz was lying. A cursory examination of the citations demonstrated they were thoroughly "mainstream" sources, including, especially, The Washington Post, The New York Times, Israel's Ha'aretz, the New York-based Jewish Week, and the aforementioned Forward.

In the meantime, on March 26, 2006, The New York Daily News, owned by Mort Zuckerman, former chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations—a major force in the Israeli lobby—featured a commentary making the claim that "there is no Israel 'lobby'"Zuckerman's tabloid repeated the old saw that Congress and American presidents have been friends of Israel "out of humanitarian concerns" and that the policies have nothing to do with any powerful "lobby" However, that claim is refuted in the very first footnote in the Mearsheimer-Walt report, which says:"The mere existence of the lobby suggests that unconditional support for Israel is not in the American national interests. If it was, one would not need an organized special interest group to bring it about. But because Israel is a strategic and moral liability, it takes relentless political pressure to keep U.S. support intact." So much for the criticisms of the basis of the report.

Meanwhile, more and more voices, in high places in academia, began publicly raising questions about the very validity of Israel's foundation, of the state as it exists today. To the distress of many, respected British-based Jewish academic, Professor Jacqueline Rose, issued a book, The Question of Zion (published by the distinguished Princeton University Press), saying that Zionism as a historical experiment has failed and that Zionism is, as she put it, "in danger of destroying itself."

In response to the academic revolt over U.S. policy toward Israel, members of Congress, prodded by the Israeli lobby, began making moves to cut federal funding for universities where professors and students were heard to be critical of Israel. Generally, the theme has been— among the congressional critics of these dissident voices—that these scholars are "anti-American" because they dare to criticize Israel and American policy favorable to Israel. At one point, Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kansas), a 2008 GOP presidential hopeful, even pondered establish-

ing a tribunal where academic critics of Israel could effectively be put on trial to determine whether they were guilty of promulgating "anti-Semitism" for criticizing Israel. (For an account of Brownback's scheme, see this author's The Judas Goats: The Enemy Within.)

In the fall of 2007, the controversial professors, Meirsheimer and Walt, issued an up-dated version of their paper as a book entitled The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy, responding to initial criticisms of the paper and describing the hysterical response by the Jewish lobby to what they had first written. They also rushed to assure readers they were responsible critics of Israel and not irresponsible "anti-Semites," even though leading Jewish lobby voices continued to insist that what the academics were saying was "anti-Semitic" even if the two professors weren't "anti-Semites." The two professors said other critics of Israel were "conspiracy theorists" and that they were not, even though, in fact, they were saying the same things that other critics of Israel were saying. This happenes to be a regular bizarre and somewhat amusing game in which some critics of Israel try to prove to the Jewish lobby and the mass media that they aren't as bad or as evil as other critics of Israel.

However, what is most disturbing, if not downright troublesome about the new book by Meirsheimer and Walt is that—despite the otherwise adequate amount of material in their volume (echoing much of what had appeared much earlier in this author's previous work, The High Priests of War)—the two actually had little to say about Israel's intrigues surrounding its nuclear Golem. They only barely noted John F. Kennedy's strenuous efforts to prevent Israel from building a nuclear arsenal and hardly factor in Israel's nuclear positioning in examining the role of the Israeli lobby and its impact on U.S. foreign policy. Along with the linguistic gyrations over the definition of "who's anti-Semitic and who isn't," hat's a serious flaw in an otherwise important work.

The war against freedom of speech in the realm of U.S. foreign policy is escalating, particularly as more and more people—academics, military leaders, intelligence specialists, theologians and others—dare to raise questions about U.S. policy toward Israel and the Muslim world. It is correct to say that in one area alone—the subject of Israel and the power of Zionism in directing U.S. foreign policy—America's vaunted "freedom of speech" is increasingly a thing of the past.

The big question is whether the revolt of the generals (accompanied by the revolt of the academics) will ultimately help bring an end to Israel's domination of American policy or whether nuclear-armed Israel will finally emerge as the world's greatest power, using its influence in America to dictate the future course of global affairs. And right now, as we shall see in our next chapter, Israel is at war with the world ...

Chapter Eighteen

Zionism's War Against the United Nations: Setting in Place a New Mechanism for Establishing a Global Imperium

The United Nations (UN) has been shelved, sidelined, consigned to the trash heap—at least temporarily—by the one world dreamers who once saw the global body as the means of establishing a world hege-mon. Today's imperialists—standard bearers for an ancient philosophy hostile to all forms of nationalism other than their own—now envision the United States as the driving force to implement the New World Order of which they have dreamed for generations. The United States is their "New Jerusalem" and they intend to use America's military might to achieve their aims.

For nearly 50 years, the major media in American told Americans—and people around the globe—that the UN was "the last best hope for mankind." That theme was a ritualistic mantra in American public schools. Anyone who dared criticize the UN was marginalized, damned as an "extremist" hostile to humanity itself.

However, in the 1970s, things began to change. As Third World nations emerged from their colonial status and as Israel's oppression of the Christian and Muslim people of Palestinian Arab heritage became a topic of worldwide concern, the UN took on a new complexion—at least as far as the media monopoly in America was concerned. Suddenly, the UN was no longer considered such a wonderful thing after all.

Finally, when—in 1975—the UN passed its historic resolution condemning Zionism as a form of racism, the wheel turned full circle. For issuing a direct challenge to Zionism, the foundation behind the establishment in 1948 of the State of Israel, seen, then as now, as a spiritual capital of an impending worldwide Zionist empire, the UN was painted by the media—much of it in the hands of Zionist families and financial interests—as an unquestioned villain.

Suddenly, criticism of the UN was quite "respectable." And in the United States, an emerging so-called "neo-conservative" movement—led by a tightly-knit clique of Jewish ex-Trotskyite communists under the tutelage of one Irving Kristol and his acolyte, Norman Podhoretz, the longtime editor of the American Jewish Committee's highly influential monthly journal, Commentary—made the burgeoning attack on the UN a centerpiece of its agenda.

However, it was not until the ascension to power, in January of 2001, of the administration of President George W Bush that the effort to "get the US out of the UN and the UN out of the US" (or variants thereof) became part of the actual policy-making framework—a virtual "mas-

ter plan" for implementing a global Zionist imperium, so to speak—in official Washington.

The appropriation of the American national security establishment by a host of neo-conservatives appointed to office by Bush—every single one of them, to a man, proteges of the aforementioned Irving Kristol, and his son, William Kristol, a powerful media commentator and behind-the-scenes policy maker in his own right—assured that the campaign against the UN would be central to Bush administration policy

In addition, of course, the anti-UN rhetoric received increasingly even more widespread support throughout the American media. For example, writing in The New York Post, a journal published by Mortimer Zuckerman, the former president of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (the governing body of the American Zionist movement), one columnist, Andrea Peyser, referred to 'the anti-American, anti-Semitic rats infesting the banks of the East River."

Should anyone still doubt that the reason for the opposition to the UN stemmed from the fact that the world body stood in the way of the demands of Israel, note the revealing commentary by Cal Thomas, a longtime associate of Rev. Jerry Falwel, one of the most vociferous advocates for Israel in America today.

In a column in the Dec. 12, 2004 issue of The Washington Times, Thomas endorsed longtime criticisms of the UN which he—by his own admission—previously considered the work of "the fringe."Thomas said that "the world would be better off without this body." Noting that many Americans never felt the UN would be good for America,Thomas asserted that he always felt that those who said such things were to be ignored. Here's what Thomas wrote:

> In college days, I was aware of them. They were the fringe., and beyond, who believed fluoridation of the public water supply was a communist plot to poison us; Dwight Eisenhower was a closet communist; the Trilateral Commission and Council on Foreign Relations were part of the drive for "one world government"; Jewish bankers ran the world economy and the United Nations should get out of the United Nations.

According to Thomas: "Without buying in to the paranoia and conspiracy theories, I am now a convert to the last one." Thomas's assertion in this regard is a candid exposition of the Zionist lobby's attitude

toward the LJN, now that the world body has very clearly fallen out of the hands of the Zionist movement and is considered, in their view, "unmanageable" or "beyond repair," so to speak.

In fact, there is absolutely no question whatsoever that the Zionists do indeed perceive the United States as the new mechanism by which they seek to accomplish their goals, pushing the UN to the sidelines.

The grand scheme for a New World Order—in the wake of America's new "imperial" role—was imparted quite directly in a major two-part policy paper in the Summer 2003 and Winter 2004 issues of The Journal of International Security Affairs, voice of the definitively influential Jewish Institute for National Security Policy (JINSA)

Previously a little-known Washington think tank, JINSA is now often publicly acknowledged as the guiding force behind Bush foreign policy today. One JINSA critic, Professor Edward Herman, has even gone so far as to describe JINSA as "a virtual agency of the Israeli government."

The author of the JINSA paper, Alexander H. Joffe, a pro-Israel academic, has been a regularly featured writer in JINSA's journal, certainly reflecting the high regard in which his views are held by the Zionist elite. His two-part series was entitled "The Empire That Dared Not Speak Its Name," propounding the theme that "America is an empire," suggesting that, yes, this is a very good thing.The new global regime to be established would find America as "the center of a new international system" in "a world that looks like America, and is therefore safe for all." However, what America "looks like" is what the Zionists want it to look like—not necessarily what the American people perceive America to be.

Joffe stated flatly that: "The end of the General Assembly as a credible body may plausibly be ascribed to the infamous 'Zionism is Racism' resolution in 1975," (which, incidentally, has since been repealed). The JINSA author contended that the world should be "grateful" that the UN has been "discredited, reduced to farce and ultimately ground to a halt."

As a result of the UN being shelved as a world government vehicle, wrote Joffe, "We now have the opportunity, and obligation, to begin again." However, he warned that even the emerging European Union (EU) is a threat to the dream of a global empire (at least, obviously, in the view of the Zionist movement).

The JINSA writer asserted that the EU is an "alternative vision for the international community," one that, as he put it, frankly is "the authentic countervision to an American Empire."

According to Joffe, the biggest problem with Europe and the EU is that "culture remains at the core of Europe's problems. Nationalism was a doctrine born in Europe, as were its vicious mutant offspring: fascism and communism." (A fervent advocate of Israeli super-nationalism, the

writer doesn't see the logic in his attack on other peoples' nationalism.)

Joffe complained that although "the new European Empire is multicultural in theory ... in reality it is dominated politically and culturally by France and economically by Germany." Today, in the EU, he said, "driven by a sense of postcolonial guilt and postwar ennui the door have been thrown open to all ideas. At the most sinister levels it has permitted and even legitimized a vast explosion of unhinged thought and action, namely anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism, and a wide variety of conspiracy theories."

In any case, what Joffe described as "the other kind of liberal internationalism" is what the Zionist movement favors and Joffe defined it: "Given our history and our values, that future lies in leveraging the American Empire in such a way that it becomes the basis of a new democratic international system."

In the second-part of his extended essay, published in the Winter 2004 issue of JINSA's journal, Joffe pursued this further, expanding on his call for what he described as "an empire that looks like America."

Yet, in spite of his rhetoric about "democracy," Joffe frankly talked about the United States engaging in massive imperial conquests in the trouble-torn regions of Africa—presumably after the United States has already made havoc in the Arab countries of the Middle East:

> The conditions under which America and its allies would simply take over and restore African countries are far from clear. What are the thresholds for intervention? What are the procedures and outcomes? Who will fight and who will pay?
>
> The restoration of Africa would involve long-term commitments and immense costs, of the sort that could only be paid for by Africa itself. That is to say, it would probably require American economic control, to go along with political and cultural control.
>
> Colonialism is always pay as you go, and it is not pretty. The question is both whether Africa can pay the price (or afford not to) and whether America has the stomach.

Of course, Africa is not the only target of Joffe and his like-minded schemers. Joffe wrote of a wide-ranging global agenda—well beyond the African continent. In the end, however, Joffe let the cat out of the bag about the real intentions of those who are using United States military power as the mechanism for a bigger agenda.

"New arrangements," he said, "must come into being under American leadership to provide an alternative for states that are willing to accept rights and responsibilities." Joffe dreams of a United Nations that has been re-made under the imperial force of the United States. And ultimately, he predicts the possibility of a world government, writing:

> Possibly, after a period of chaos and anger, which in any event would simply intensify existing states of being, the institution [the United Nations]] might be bludgeoned into changing. [emphasis added]
>
> Rather than a club that admits all, the 21st century United Nations might—someday, somehow—be remade into an exclusive, by invitation, members-only group, of free, democratic states, sharing similar values. Or in the end, replaced by one. That day, however, may be decades off.

Should there be any doubt that he is talking about world government, note Joffe's concluding words:

> The best way to preserve the American empire is to eventually give it up. Setting the stage for global governance can only be done with American leadership and American-led institutions of the sort schematically outlined here.

What it all comes down to is the use of America's military power to advance another (secret) agenda altogether. Here, in the pages of a Zionist journal, we have learned precisely what the "story behind the story" actually is.

The Zionist master plan has nothing to do, even with a "strong America" or, for that matter, even with America itself. The United States is simply a pawn—albeit a powerful one—in the game, being ruthlessly shifted about in a scheme for world dominance by an elite few operating behind the scenes.

Further evidence that this is indeed the view of the Zionist movement, comes from no less a source than Israel's former ambassador to the United Nations, Dore Gold.

In his 2004 book, Tower of Babble: How the United Nations Has Fueled Global Chaos, Gold outlined a scenario for a new global regime—under United States diktat—pushing aside the UN.Ambassador Gold wrote in no uncertain terms as follows::

> The United States and its Western allies won the Cold War but obviously no longer have the common goal of containing Soviet expansionism as the glue holding together a coalition. Still, a coalition of allies could start with neutralizing the greatest threat to international peace today: global terrorism, another threat that the UN has failed to counter effectively ...
>
> The issue of terrorism relates to a number of other concerns common to all of these nations: the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the proliferation of sensitive military technologies, terrorist financing and money laundering, and the incitement of ethnic hatred and violence in national media as well as in educational institutions. Their commitment to curtailing these threats would lead democracies around the world to join together and take action ...
>
> Such a democratic coalition would be far more representative of the national will of each country's citizens than the UN currently is. Oddly, by going outside the UN, these countries would be recommitting themselves to the principles of which the UN was originally founded. They would embrace the principles laid out in the UN Charter and insist that members of the coalition fully adhere—not just give lip service—to a basic code of international conduct ...

In short, while Gold and his Zionist allies see global government worthy of support, they do not see the UN as the means by which to achieve it. Gold elaborated further, describing a new mechanism for achieving a New World Order:

> Because the UN has lost the moral clarity of its founders, the United States and its allies must take the lead. The world will follow in time.
>
> If more than one hundred nations wanted to join the Community of Democracies, the democratic ideal must be powerful ...

In fact, although it was not widely noticed at the time, a so-called "Community of Democracies" was inaugurated by the Clinton administration's Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in June of 2000. So the mechanism is already in place.

Gold concluded that the United States and it allies might ultimately "reinvigorate the UN and make the organization's system of collective security," hut, he added,"that day is a long way off."

In the meantime, media voices for the Israeli lobby have promoted Gold's concept of what might be described as a "parallel" UN under the domination of the United States and its purported allies.

For example, writing in The Washington Times, Clifford D. May, raised this question: "Is it not high time at least to consider alternatives to the United Nations, to explore possibly developing new organizations in which democratic societies would work together against common enemies and for common goals?"

However, the evidence is indisputable that this is not just the Zionist propaganda line. This philosophy directs the thinking of the Bush administration. When President George Bush made his call for a world-wide "democratic" revolution in his second inaugural address, he was doing little more than echoing the opinions of Israeli cabinet minister, Natan Sharansky, an influential figure who is considered more hard-line than even Israel's ruling premier,Ariel Sharon.

Not only did Bush publicly and warmly endorse Sharansky, but media reports revealed that Sharansky played a major part in helping draft Bush's inaugural address.

This is particularly relevant, in the context of Sharansky's harsh words for the UN and what he has offered in his own work, The Case for Democracy, widely touted as "the bible" of Bush foreign policy. In the closing pages of his book, Sharansky summed it up:

> To protect and promote democracy around the world, I believe that a new international institution, one in which only those governments who give their people the right to be heard and counted will themselves have a right to be heard and counted can be an enormously important force for democratic change ... This community of free nations will not emerge on its own ... I am convinced that a successful effort to expand freedom around the world must be inspired and led by the United States.

So it is once again: the concept of the United States being the force for global realignment. And although there was worldwide criticism— even from so-called "democracies"—of Bush's call for worldwide democratic revolution based on the Sharansky model, the American Jewish newspaper, Forward, noted on that "one world leader endorsed Bush's

approach unreservedly"—former Israeli Prime Minister (and current finance minister) Benjamin Netanyahu. Citing a speech the Israeli leader gave in Florida, Forward said Netanyahu proclaimed:

> President Bush called for democratization and he's on to something very profound. Can the Arab world be democratized? Yes—slowly, painfully. And who can democratize it? As in everywhere else in the world, in all societies, whether it's Latin America, the former Soviet Union, or South Africa, democracy was always achieved by outside pressure. And who delivered that pressure? One country: the United States.

To say more would belabor this simple conclusion: Although, for years, the Zionists denounced American patriots for saying that it was time to "Get the US out of the UN and the UN out of the US," now that the Zionists have lost control of the UN—which they originally perceived as their vehicle for establishing a New World Order—the Zionists are targeting the UN, precisely because they have determined that the military and financial resources of the United States are their best bet for establishing that New World Order of which they long dreamed. The Zionists want the United States to serve as the engine for assembling a world empire under their control.

Meanwhile, a key point in the Zionist drive for a global imperium includes—as it has for many years—the drive to bring down the Islamic Republic of Iran. Like the war against the secular regime in Iraq of former leader Saddam Hussein—a bloody war that has brought that once thriving republic to its knees—the ongoing campaign by Israel and its adherents in Washington—best exemplified by President George W Bush himself—to dislodge the Islamic regime in Iran. This war is being waged in the name of preventing Iran from assembling its own nuclear arsenal, even as Israel's Golem—one of the most advanced on the face of the planet—remains in place, a central element in the problem of nuclear proliferation that the United States absolutely refuses to address.

In the chapters which follow we will be examining the very definitive role of Israel and its American lobby in escalating efforts to confront Iranian independence on the world stage. There is no question about it: Israel and the international Zionist movement is the prime mover behind the push for war against Iran. Let's look at the facts ...

Chapter Nineteen

Targeting Iraq and Iran: A Key Element of Zionism's Long-Term Strategy for Middle East—and Globalz—Domination

The ongoing effort to spark an American war against Iran has long been in the making. It is part of a policy of so-called "rogue state roll-back"—a plan, originating at the highest levels of the Zionist lobby in America—that has now seen the first drive toward its fulfillment with the attack on Iran's longtime Arab enemy, Iraq. Now, incredibly enough, Iran is the target— despite the American quagmire in Iraq.

"Rogue states" is an inflammatory term that has been used by Israel and its lobby in America—as well as by those who tout the imperialist propaganda line—to describe such largely Islamic countries as Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Sudan and other countries that are perceived (whether correctly or not) as threats to Israel.

The war against "rogue states" is all part of the effort to set in place a "new world order" in which no nation can retain its national sovereignty in the face of American military might held in the hands of a warlike "Israel-centric" combine of influence at the highest levels of the American government and supported by the major media.

The scheme for "rogue states rollback" is, in fact, part of a long-range plan by higher-ups in the international policymaking elite, specifically the hard-line supporters of Israel.

This plan for "rogue states rollback"—specifically targeting Iraq and Iran—was first enunciated on May 22, 1993, in a then-secret speech by a former Israeli government propagandist, Martin Indyk before the Washington Institute on Near East Affairs, a private, pro-Israel pressure group. At the time, the small, maverick American newspaper, The Spotlight, was the only publication to reveal this plan for aggression.

What made Indyk's strategic plan for war so explosive was that when Indyk outlined the policy, he was serving as President Clinton's handpicked Middle East policy "expert" on the National Security Council.

Born in England and raised in Australia, Indyk took up residence in Israel but was later given "instant" U.S. citizenship by special proclamation of Clinton just hours after Clinton was sworn into office on Jan. 20, 1993—one of Clinton's first official acts. Later this former Israeli propagandist was appointed to serve as U.S. ambassador to Israel, his obvious conflict of interest notwithstanding.

Within a year, the thrust of Indyk's plan for war against Iraq and Iran was formally promoted by the powerful New York-based Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)—the American branch of the London-based Royal Institute for International Affairs, the de facto foreign policy arm

of the international Rothschild banking dynasty, premier patrons of the state of Israel and the Zionist world network. This scheme was also publicly announced, at the same time, as an official policy of the Clinton administration, although it had been in the making for over a year.

An Associated Press report, published in the Feb. 28, 1994 issue of The Washington Post, announced that W. Anthony Lake, President Clinton's National Security Advisor, had laid out a plan for "dual containment" of Iraq and Iran, both of which Lake labeled "outlaw" and "backlash" states.

Lake's comments as reported were from an article by Lake just published in the March/April 1994 issue of Foreign Affairs, the quarterly journal of the CFR.

On Oct, 30, 1993, the Post frankly described the CFR as "the nearest thing we have to a ruling establishment in the United States," saying that they are "the people who, for more than half a century, have managed our international affairs and our military-industrial complex." Twenty-four top members of the Clinton administration—along with Clinton— were CFR members.

There was a minor difference in the policy as set forth by Lake: Iraq was first targeted for destruction. Iran would come later.

Lake said the Clinton administration supported Iraqi exiles who wanted to overthrow Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein. Lake said that although Iran was what he called "the foremost sponsor of terrorism and assassination worldwide," the Clinton administration saw the possibility of better relations with Iran.

In early 1995 the then-newly elected Republican House Speaker, Newt Gingrich, long a vocal advocate for Israel, gave a little-noticed speech in Washington before a gathering of military and intelligence officers calling for a Middle East policy that was, in his words,"designed to force the replacement of the current regime in Iran ... the only long-range solution that makes any sense."

That the then-de facto leader of the "opposition" Republican Party endorsed this policy was no real surprise since, at that time, Gingrich's wife was being paid $2,500 a month by the Israel Export Development Company, an outfit which lured American companies out of the United States into a high-tech business park in Israel.

In the next chapter we shall see that despite ongoing loudly trumpeted claims in Jewish newspapers that the American Jewish community (and Israel as well) consider the Iraq war to have been an egregious blunder on the part of the United States, the truth is that Israel itself was a prime mover behind (and the chief beneficiary of) the United States' bloody venture in Iraq and is now, likewise, pushing for war on Iran.

Chapter Twenty

Qui Bono? Israel the Unique Beneficiary of U.S. Policy Toward Iraq and Iran

A respected small-circulation New York-based media outlet provided a privileged, "inside "view of the behind-the-scenes forces that played a part in dragging the United States into the war in Iraq that almost the entire world opposed.

It turns out that another country—not the United States—"uniquely benefited" from the war—despite the fact young Americans continue dying and the U.S. occupation of Iraq increasingly appears to evolving into another Vietnam-style quagmire.

On April 16, 2004 Forward— perhaps the most prestigious Jewish community weekly in America—provided readers a fascinating overview of the circumstances leading up to the war in Iraq, presenting a starkly different, but certainly more accurate, recitation of events almost completely suppressed by the American print and broadcast media over the past year.

Forward noted that "on the eve of the war, Israel was a quiet but enthusiastic supporter of America's war plans. Saddam Hussein's military power, it was universally agreed, made him one of the Jewish state's most dangerous adversaries ... His overthrow was seen as eliminating Israel's most serious existential threat ..."

This assertion is very much in contrast with the view—widespread in America—that Saddam was a threat to the United States.The fact that Israel viewed Saddam in such a light was hardly ever pointed out. Nor did President Bush venture so far as to cite Saddam's purported threat to Israel—at least not to general audiences. At best, Bush would say Saddam was a threat to "America and our allies," but never naming the one ally—Israel—that did perceive Saddam a threat.

Pointing out that official Israeli spokesmen "took care in the months before last year's invasion to keep a low profile," Forward said they feared "that aggressive advocacy would fuel accusations that Israel or its Jewish allies were pushing America into war for Israel's benefit."

As far as Saddam's much-discussed "weapons of mass destruction" are concerned, Forward revealed that the Israel army's intelligence branch "eagerly cooperated with American and British agencies, sharing information on Iraqi capabilities and intentions . . . meant to help the American action." However, Forward was quick to note that sources in Israel "deny that Israel supplied biased information."

Yet, the fact that no weapons of mass destruction have been found in Iraq—a fact that continues to bedevil George W. Bush—obviously rais-

es this question: Why, if Israel's intelligence service is "the best in the world" (as many American supporters of Israel grandly proclaim) was the Bush administration insisting the weapons were in Iraq, if even Israeli intelligence—which is known to have tentacles throughout the Arab world and even inside Saddam's Iraq—was unable to find them.

Then, again, critics might suggest that perhaps Israel's denial of having supplied biased information could, in fact, simply be untrue.

However, Forward described the rather creative official Israeli excuse for the apparent disparity between truth and reality: the Israeli parliament's foreign affairs and defense committee claims that the intelligence sharing between the United States and Israel "created a negative feedback effect: Information that Israel gave to Western agencies was then passed back to the Israeli intelligence community ostensibly proving the initial report to be true."

Finally after the war began, said Forward, Israel's "political and military brass showed ill-disguised feelings of elation," and now, in Forward's estimation, "whatever analyses may yet emerge from Washington or other capitals, Israel clearly did benefit from the removal of Saddam as a military force on the eastern front."

With remarkable candor, Forward said flat out that Israel "uniquely benefited "from the war—a point that may surprise many American families who lost sons and daughters in a war they thought was strictly in defense of America.And as a consequence of America's growing troubles in the region as a direct result of the war, Forward asserted, the Israelis and their American supporters who welcomed the war are even more fearful of letting their views be known, even more so than before the war took place.

Evidently, the Israelis would prefer Americans to think that the war was fought because Saddam Hussein was, in George W Bush's apparently unfounded claim,"the guy who tried to kill my dad," or because of that popular bugaboo, "big oil." But under no circumstances should anyone mention the one word that really does summarize the underlying cause of the war: "Israel."

Lest one think that this is "only" Forwards opinion, note, too, that no less a figure than Philip Zelikow—later the executive director of the commission "investigating" the 9-11 terrorist attacks—publicly asserted the same thing almost two years before (although his comments received no attention whatsoever in the major media.

Speaking at the University of Virginia on September 10, 2002, at a forum examining the impact of the 9-11 terrorist attacks, Zelikow—then a member of the Bush-appointed Presidential Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board—said flatly that the Iraq war was primarily fought to

protect Israel and that Iraq was never the threat to the United States that the Bush administration proclaimed. Speaking frankly, Zelikow laid it out simply, commenting:

> Why would Iraq attack America or use nuclear weapons against us? I'll tell you what I think the real threat [is] and actually has been since 1990—it's the threat against Israel And this is the threat that dare not speak its name, because the Europeans don't care deeply about that threat, I will tell you frankly. And the American government doesn't want to lean too hard on it rhetorically, because it is not a popular sell.

Although Zelikow's revealing comments did not receive any major media attention at the time, Emad Mekay of the independent Inter Press Service found Zelikow's statement in a transcript of his remarks and has since made it available to those who are interested. But the major media continues to suppress these highly pointed remarks, which, taken together in the big picture, do point toward a different motivation for the Iraq war than the average American knows about.

Despite all this, the reverberations from the ugly and devastating U.S. invasion of Iraq continue to echo around the globe. As time passes, the truth about why the United States waged war against Iraq is becoming all the more obvious: it was all about U.S. favoritism toward Israel.

A damning indictment of the U.S. "special relationship" with Israel and how it led to the invasion of Iraq, has now come in a book by veteran international correspondent John Cooley entitled An Alliance Against Babylon: The U.S., Israel, and Iraq (Pluto Press, 2005).

Formerly a correspondent for ABC News and The Christian Science Monitor, Cooley pointed out that most media coverage of the two wars the United States has engaged against Iraq "ignore an important factor," that being "the role played by Israel, and the relationships, antagonistic and otherwise, of the Jewish people with the people and states of former Mesopotamia, now Iraq, from Old Testament Bible times until now."

Although many critics of the war loudly proclaim that the war is "about oil," Cooley's cogently argued historical work makes it absolutely clear that the war was precisely—as former Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) said, shortly before his retirement—about "President Bush's policy to secure Israel."

Cooley's overview of Israel's terror war against the British occupation forces in Palestine in the late 1940s pulls no punches. He pointed out that when Jewish underground forces led by future Israeli prime

minister Menachem Begin and his colleagues in the so-called "Stern Gang," blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on June 22,1946, the Jewish terrorists were "disguised as Arabs," a tactic that has long been used effectively by Israel in its various and sundry terrorist endeavors.

In the massacre at the King David Hotel—which was the British military headquarters—Begin's team left 90 people dead, including 15 Jews, demonstrating, contrary to what many misinformed people believe, that the Israelis are quite willing to sacrifice their own for what might be perceived (in their eyes) as "the greater good."

Regarding Iraq itself, while Cooley was no defender of Saddam Hussein, he made it quite clear that despite the fact that there was domestic opposition to Saddam—largely the Kurdish minority, Shia Muslim clergy, and Communists—"all of these groups had been weakened by emergence of the growingly prosperous and politically docile middle class that Saddam had taken pains to create."

In other words, while Saddam was indeed killing Islamic religious hard-liners—the same people that President George Bush proudly declared his intention to kill anywhere he found them—Saddam was setting in place a strong country with a thriving middle class.

Perhaps it is thus no wonder that prior to the first American attack on Iraq—in 2001—followed by crippling sanctions imposed on the country at the insistence of the United States, both the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund were preparing to declare Iraq a "First World Nation."

Cooley also examined the evidence that had already been outlined in American Free Press, namely "allegations about Israeli involvement" in the infamous Abu Ghraib torture scandal, which, as Cooley noted were "repeated by Brigadier General Janice Karpinski, the U.S. officer in chare of Abu Ghraib," whom Cooley notes, "was suspended from her command after the revelations."

In summarizing the consequences of the bloody American venture in Iraq—which shows no sign of getting any better, protests by President Bush and his cheerleaders notwithstanding—Cooley noted that the destruction of Iraq's armed forces, a "cherished objective" of Israel, had been accomplished "largely without loss of either Israeli blood or treasure." Cooley wrote that there will never be peace in the Middle East until, as he first asserted in the 1960s and repeats today, "until there is a fair settlement between Israel and the Palestinian Arabs."

Now with the advent of John Cooley's book regarding the U.S. and Israel vis-a-vis Iraq, what is so remarkable is that Cooley's thesis mirrors—from both a historical standpoint and from a current events standard—a thesis regarding Israel's central positioning in U.S. policy

toward Iran outlined in 1991 in the book Iran, Israel and the United States by a leading American conservative academic, Dr. Henry Paolucci.

In addition, as far back as June 14, 1994, in a story beginning on page one, The Washington Post let the cat out of the bag when it declared, in a headline on the inner "jump" page that "CIA sees nuclear weapon program in North Korea as a threat to Israel," reporting that— effectively unbeknownst to most Americans—the real concern about North Korea's nuclear aims was actually founded on the security interests not of the United States, per se, but those of Israel.

So the "theory" that Israel is a cause of America's plight in the world today is not just limited to the problem of Iraq. It goes much, much further. Thus, as the Bush administration and its allies in Israel continue to raise the question of whether Iran is engaged in hostile nuclear weapons development, and whether North Korea's nuclear intentions are dangerous to the United States, Americans would do well to ponder the simple question: "Is it worth it? Are Israel's interests really those of America—and vice versa?"

Chapter Twenty-One

"Indelibly Jewish Fingerprints": Who Wants America to Wage War Against Iran?

"While Jewish communal leaders focus most of their current lobbying efforts on pressing the United States to take a tough line against Iran and its nuclear program, some are privately voicing fears that they will be accused of driving America into a war with the regime in Tehran."

With that amazing admission—presented here unedited in any way—one of the most distinguished Jewish community newspapers in America—the New York-based Forward—acknowledged on Feb. 2, 2007 that it is the leaders of American Jewish organizations who are pushing bellicose U.S. policies against Iran that are being carried out by the Bush administration.

Forward admitted that what has been referred to as "the Jewish lobby" fears a "public backlash" from Americans who do not believe that a war against Iran is in America's best interests and that many Americans now believe (or are increasingly starting to believe) the argument—put forth even before the United States invaded Iraq—that it was pro- Israel advocacy groups that were largely responsible for the ongoing debacle in Iraq. However, according to Forward, those whom it described as "Jewish groups" are now trying to convince the American public of the validity of their own pet conspiracy theory that Iran is not only a threat to Israel—their primary interest—but also to the West and even "pro-American Sunni Muslim states in the region."

In other words, pro-Israel Jewish groups in the United States are actually saying that Muslim states such as, for example, Saudi Arabia—a longtime target of Israeli ire—need to be protected, too. Evidently, since Saudi Arabia is indeed fearful of a powerful Iran—nuclear-armed or otherwise—Israel and its proponents now believe that they can make it appear as though a U.S. attack on Iran is more than just "another war for Israel," which, of course, is precisely what a war on Iran would be.

Forward even cited Jess Hordes, an official of the Washington office of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), who claimed that "it is a fact that Iran is a danger to the whole world." Hordes claimed that this rhetoric is not intended to "hide our concerns about Israel," but his protests ring hollow since it is clear that it has been the pro- Israel lobby's concerns about Iran that have been driving current American policy toward Iran just as it was that same lobby's concerns about Iraq that drove American policy toward that now-vanquished Arab republic.

Forward itself went so far as to admit, in candid terms, that "many advocacy efforts, even when not linked to Israel, carry indelibly Jewish fingerprints" and that "Jewish groups are indeed playing a lead role in pressing for a hard line on Iran."

Citing a recent speech in Israel by Malcolm Hoenlein, executive vice chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Forward noted that Hoenlein was particularly distressed that many highly placed individuals of some renown—ranging from former President Jimmy Carter to retired Gen. Wesley Clark (who said that "New York money people" were behind the push for war against Iran) to former UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter and professors Stephen Walt (of Harvard) and John Mearsheimer (of the University of Chicago)—have all questioned the power of the Israeli lobby in dictating U.S. policy toward Iran and Iraq.

In addition, former Secretary of State Colin Powell is said to have alleged that "the JINSA crowd," referring to the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, played a major part in stoking up the U.S. invasion of Iraq, which Powell long vehemently opposed but later supported, resulting in his own loss of public credibility as a consequence.

Hoenlein and other leaders of the wealthy and powerful Jewish community were echoing earlier suggestions, previously put forth by their colleagues, that key figures in America's policy-making elites were now openly criticizing Zionist power in America. This, according to Hoenlein, "is a cancer that starts from the top and works its way down. It poisons the opinions among elites which trickle down into society."

Forward noted that two Israeli authors, Michael Oren and Yossi Klein Halevi—associates of the Shalem Center, a Jerusalem-based think tank—said that Iran, in Forward's assessment of their claims, is "the main threat to Israeli survival, regional stability and to the entire world order." Forward added that, "This theme has been echoed in publications and press releases put out by most major Jewish groups, including [the American Israel Public Affairs Committee] and the Conference of Presidents." So a war against Iran is very much on the Jewish agenda.

Neither Serbian-American nor Croatian-American groups want the United States to go to war with Iran. Nor do Italian-American or Polish-American or Irish-American groups want such a war. No Asian-American organizations have demanded that Iran be dismembered, nor have any groups representing Native Americans or African-Americans made the issue of Iran a centerpiece of their public policy. Likewise, there can be found no evidence that any—not any—other ethnic, cultural or religious organizations—other than those representing Jewish and pro-Israel interests—have called for a U.S. attack on Iran.

All things considered: Can there be any doubt about who wants war with Iran—or why?

Chapter Twenty-Two

They're Back: The High Priests of the Iraq War Are Now Aiming to Destroy Iran

Even as the United States gets mired ever deeper in the bloody and explosive cauldron that has become Iraq, the very forces who were the primary movers behind America's entry into that disaster are now reinvigorating their push to achieve another longtime goal: the destruction of Iran. At the same time, there are some sensible voices of restraint— and perhaps unexpected ones at that—urging that the calls for war be rejected in favor of diplomacy.

Although—in the January 2007 issue of Vanity Fair, published by Zionist billionaire S.I. Newhouse, a leading financial backer of the Anti-Defamation League and other Israeli lobby front groups—a host of eminent neo-conservative pro-Israel stalwarts went out of their way to deny their culpability in instigating the war against Iraq, which everyone knows they did indeed do, these same elements are now gearing up to promote U.S. military action against Iran.

Their rhetoric of denial regarding their bellicose demands for a U.S. attack on Iraq echoes the same kind of noisy deception coming out of Israel from a host of Israeli academics, military strategists and others who are now attacking George W. Bush for the Iraq war, even though it was Israel and its neo-conservative allies inside the Bush administration that were most adamant about the need to not only attack Iraq but also bring down Saddam Hussein. This is a final goal that even the current president's own father, George H.W. Bush, decided not to pursue in the American attack on Iraq in the first Persian Gulf war of 1991.

Now, in the midst of denying their responsibility for the Iraqi quagmire, the neo-conservatives are openly preparing their propaganda campaign to induce American blood and treasure being deployed against Iran—not only to stop Iran's alleged progress toward nuclear weapons but, as in Iraq, to destroy that nation's current government.

In the November/December 2006 issue of Foreign Policy magazine, the small-circulation but highly influential publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a leading New World Order "think tank," well-known neo-conservative publicist Joshua Muravchik is calling for his fellow "neo-cons" to "admit their mistakes ... and start making the case for bombing Iran."

Muravchik—who operates out of the American Enterprise Institute (which includes top neo-conservative mastermind Richard Perle among its chief tacticians)—said that "Make no mistake, President Bush will need to bomb Iran's nuclear facilities before leaving office." He goes on to say to his fellow war-mongers: "We need to pave the way intellectu-

ally now and be prepared to defend the action when it comes."

There's no question about it: the neo-conservative High Priests of War (whose intrigues were first examined in this author's previous work, The High Priests of War) are determined to destroy Iran, just as they destroyed Iraq. It's been one of their longtime geopolitical goals and they refuse to permit public dissatisfaction with what's happened in Iraq to deter them from accomplishing what they intend.

In the meantime, no less than Bruce Laingen, the former charge de affaires for the U.S. Embassy in Iran—who was among the Americans who were held hostage (from 1979 until January 1981) following the Islamic revolution in Iran—is publicly calling for the Bush administration to put aside its inflammatory language and seek direct discussions with Iran. In a letter to the editor of The New York Times, published on Jan. 13, 2007, Laingen wrote:

> The United States and Iran must talk. Not with the mutually negative public rhetoric that for the 27 years since the 1979 hostage crisis has eroded the trust needed for any diplomatic exchange; not indirectly, as we do now on the nuclear issue through our Security Council and European Union colleagues; but frontally and frankly as responsible powers with shared interests in a critically important part of the world.
>
> The absence of dialogue has made no sense on any count—strategic, human, historic, political, cultural. It has complicated our relationships with every other country in the region. We alone among the powers have chosen to signal in this way our reservations about Iran's conduct in the world arena.
>
> Geography alone compels Iran's participation in helping deal with both Iraq and Afghanistan, not to mention long-term regional security understandings in the Persian Gulf region. A host of other issues compel dialogue, including Iran's obligations vis-a-vis the former hostages.
>
> Talking won't be easy. Formal diplomatic relations are a long way off. But we lose nothing now by joining directly with our allies and friends in direct soundings of Iran's intentions.

The fact that Laingen—who certainly knows quite a bit about Iran and its people and who obviously might have an axe to grind with the

Iranian government—is saying such things (so contradictory to the views of the warmongering neo-conservatives) is something that Americans need to know about. But Laingen's sensible concerns have been sidelined by the mass media in America that prefers to help stoke up American fears of Iran, saying that the Islamic republic is somehow a threat to the United States (and, of course, Israel).

Whether the American people will be hornswoggled again and tricked into another senseless war remains to be seen. But peace-minded people who want to preserve their country would do best to listen to what Laingen—and not the neo-conservatives—has to say.

Chapter Twenty-Three

"New York Money People": Jewish-Born American General Points the Finger at the Warmongers

New York money is not only playing a big part in 2008 presidential campaign politics, but it's also a driving force behind the ongoing push by pro-Israel fanatics at the highest levels of U.S. policy-making to force the United States into a senseless war against Iran.

That's the only conclusion that can be reached based on a survey of multiple and wide-ranging news reports—circulating largely within publications in Israel and in the American Jewish community—that have not been brought to the attention of most Americans through the aegis of the so-called "mainstream media."

It's almost as if the major media in America is simply determined to prevent average Americans from knowing that there are some people who believe that Israel and its well-heeled backers in the United States are the primary advocates for U.S. military action against Iran.

Perhaps the most explosive comments in this regard came from Gen. Wesley Clark (ret.), who was a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2004 and who—until then, at least—was considered a likely candidate for the Democratic nod in 2008. In an interview with columnist Arianna Huffington, Clark said that he believed that the Bush administration is determined to wage war against Iran. When asked why he believed this, Clark said:

> You just have to read what's in the Israeli press. The Jewish community is divided but there is so much pressure being channeled from the New York money people to the office seekers.

In short, Clark was saying that powerful New York-based financial interests (those whom he called "the New York money people") are putting pressure on political candidates and incumbent politicians to support a war against Iran.

In fact, Clark was correct. Jewish community newspapers have indeed noted, time and again over the past several years, that many in the American Jewish community and in Israel are urging U.S. military action against Iran. And in Israel, of course, the bellicose talk of Israel itself attacking Iran is commonly and publicly discussed with free abandon. All of this is little known to the American public.

Despite this, Clark came under fire and was accused of "anti-Semitism" or otherwise charged with lending credence to what are dismissed as "anti-Israel and anti- Jewish conspiracy theories," which—

Clark's angry critics said—suggest that Israel and its supporters are prime movers behind the drive for war.

Because Clark is the son of a Jewish father (although he didn't know that until several years ago, having been raised by a Christian mother and a Christian step-father who never told Clark of his Jewish heritage), some Jewish leaders were pulling their punches, recognizing that it sounded somewhat outlandish to call Clark "anti-Jewish." But the word is definitely out in the Jewish community: "Clark can't be trusted."

On Jan. 12,2007, the New York-based Jewish newspaper, Forward, carried a front-page story zinging Clark for his remarks, noting that,"The phrase New York money people' struck unpleasant chords with many pro-Israel activists. They interpreted it as referring to the Jewish community, which is known for its significant financial donations to political candidates."

The fact that Jewish leaders and publications were attacking Clark for using the term "New York money people" was ironic, inasmuch as just the week before the furor over Clark's comments, the same Forward, in its own Jan. 5, 2007 issue, had a front-page story announcing that pro-Israel stalwart U.S. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) had lined up significant financial support for his own 2008 presidential campaign from those whom—in its own headline—Forward called "New York money men."

In that revealing article, describing McCain's "heavily Jewish finance committee," Forward announced that, in recent weeks, "McCain has been signaling that an attention to Jewish issues will remain on his agenda as his campaign moves forward." The Jewish newspaper did not mention whether McCain will direct any attention to Christian, Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu issues—or any other issues of concern to other religious groups.

The article in Forward made it clear that support from these "New York money men" is critical in the forthcoming presidential campaign and that it could be pivotal, whether that money stays in McCain's camp or ultimately goes elsewhere.

This information could prove a surprise to grass-roots Republicans all over America who think (apparently incorrectly) that they are the ones who actually pick their party's presidential nominee.

In addition, in light of the fact that Jewish groups attacked Clark for suggesting that "New York money people" were pressuring political candidates to push for war against Iran, it is interesting to note that Forward pointed out that one of the key "New York money men" supporting McCain cited the issue of Iran as one of the reasons why he was boosting the Arizona senator.

Dr. Ben Chouake, who is president of the pro-Israel NORPAC, a political action committee, and a member of McCain's finance committee, was cited as having remarked that Iran is "an immense threat to the United States, and this is an immense threat to Israel," and that "the person that is the most capable, most experienced, most courageous to defend our country, would be John McCain."

Clearly, the "New York money people" are playing a major part in the American political arena, throwing their weight behind who gets elected—and who doesn't—and whether or not America goes to war.

That's something that Americans need to know about, but they had better not count on the mass media to tell them about it.

Chapter Twenty-Four

"Made in Israel": The Real Origin of the Iranian Nuclear Controversy As Determined by Top Nuclear Weapons Expect

Americans should take note: He was right about the fact that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction. Now, Scott Ritter, the former top United Nations weapons inspector in Iraq, is taking on the international clamor over Iran's burgeoning nuclear program, remarking flatly in a new book that the controversy is "a crisis made in Israel.".

The ongoing controversy over alleged nuclear weapons development by Iran is "a crisis made in Israel." This charge was made in the most recent book by Scott Ritter, who—for seven years—was one of the top United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq.

A tough-talking Marine, who was a ballistic missile advisor to General Norman Schwarzkopf in the first Gulf War, Ritter said that the same pattern of lies and disinformation used by the Bush administration and its allies in Israel to get the United States engaged in the war against Iraq is now being used to drag the United States into a war against Iran.

Ritter's book, Target Iran, subtitled "The Truth About the White House's Plans for Regime Change," issued a warning Americans need to heed, because everything Ritter said earlier about the drive for war against Iraq was proved correct.

As famed investigative journalist Seymour Hersh has said: "The most important thing to know about Scott Ritter, the man, is that he was right. He told us again and again in 2002 and early 2003 as President George Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair prepared for war in Iraq that there were no weapons [of mass destruction]."

Ritter is able to speak out so profoundly because he is virtually inoculated from the charge of being "anti-Israel" or "anti-Semitic." As Ritter notes in his book, in his service in the military and in the weapons inspection field, he placed his life on the line in defense of Israel, a point that his critics are loathe to mention. Ritter wrote:

> The conflict currently under way between the United States and Iran is, first and foremost, a conflict born in Israel. It is based upon an Israeli contention that Iran poses a threat to Israel, and defined by Israeli assertions that Iran possesses a nuclear weapons program. None of this has been shown to be true, and indeed much of the allegations made by Israel against Iran have been clearly demonstrated as being false.And yet the United States continues to trumpet the Israeli

> claims, and no individual more loudly so than the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, John Bolton.
>
> If Iran were to attack Israel without provocation, I would argue long and hard for America to come to the aid of its friend and ally. But I cannot tolerate the idea of America being pushed into a war of aggression against Iran when Iran threatens neither Israel nor America.And this is what is happening today. Israel has, through a combination of ignorance, fear and paranoia, elevated Iran to a threat status that it finds unacceptable.
>
> Israel has engaged in policies that have further inflamed this situation. Israel displays an arrogance and rigidity when it comes to developing any diplomatic solution to the Iranian issue.
>
> And Israel demands that the United States take the lead in holding Iran to account. Israel threatens military action against Iran, knowing only too well that in doing so Israel would be committing America to war as well.
>
> When it comes to Iran, Israel can no longer be said to be behaving as a friend of America. And it is high time we in America had the courage to recognize this, and take appropriate actions.

Ritter noted the United States and Israel are "two completely distinct nations, and should never be treated as one and indivisible." He said the United States must rein in powerful Israeli lobby organizations such as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. Americans also need to recognize, he said, that "national loyalty is a one-way street, and in America, for Americans, that one-way sign points only toward the United States of America.

Those who are interested in an in-depth examination of the realities—not the propaganda—about Iraq and its nuclear program (and the way the truth has been twisted by Israel and its allies in the Bush administration) should read Ritter's book.

Chapter Twenty-Five

Iran's President Speaks Out: Challenging the New World Order Head On

This author had the opportunity to visit New York City on Sept. 20, 2006 where I participated in a closed-door roundtable conference with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a small group of invited journalists and academics. What follows is a report on the comments by Ahmadinejad at that forum as originally published in the October 9, 2006 issue of American Free Press, the national weekly newspaper based on Capitol Hill in Washington.

Even as The New York Sun—a fanatically pro-Israel daily—was editorially demanding his arrest "as a material witness or even as a suspect" in terrorism, outspoken Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was arriving in New York for a whirlwind visit last week. Speaking to the United Nations and visiting privately with different groups, journalists and scholars were anxious to hear what the ex-university professor-turned Mayor of Tehran-turned Iranian president had to say. This comes at a time when the Islamic republic of Iran is at the center of the global spotlight, the focus of provocative, warlike rhetoric by Israel and its ally, George W Bush.

Even Ahmadinejad's invitation to speak at the Manhattan headquarters of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), meeting place of the American foreign policy elite, created a stir. Led by Holocaust industry figure Elie Wiesel, Jewish members of the CFR threatened mass resignation if the Iranian leader was permitted to speak, although the revolt never materialized.

Wiesel—whose own credibility is questionable—told anyone who would listen that he believed Ahmadinejad should be declared persona non grata in the United States and that Iran itself should be expelled from the UN while Ahmadinejad is president.

In the end, the proposed formal dinner with Ahmadinejad at the CFR was nixed since Jewish members of the CFR said that they could not abide the thought of sitting down to dinner with the Iranian leader. Instead,Ahmadinejad met with a small number of CFR members in a less formal gathering.

As pro-Israel groups organized boisterous mass anti- Ahmadinejad demonstrations outside the United Nations and the hotel where Ahmadinejad was headquartered, there were some sane folks who did agree to speak with the Iranian president and listen to what he had to say, without interruption. This contrasted with the treatment often accorded Ahmadinejad by biased American media personalities and by the American president who refuses to speak to the Iranian leader.

Speaking at the gathering of the bellicose rhetoric of Bush and his Israeli allies, Ahmadinejad insisted U.S. policy makers are "too smart" to think seriously about war with Iran. In fact, he said, the threats and tough talk by the United States are being used by the White House to apply what he called "psychological pressure" on the European countries to support sanctions against Iraq.

Ahmadinejad predicted any military moves against Iran "will not favor the United States government or the American people." He pointed out that, even now, "All of the people of our region are beginning to hate the United States because of the policies of the Bush administration." And it should be noted, that fully 118 countries recently aligned themselves with Iran's drive to secure nuclear energy for peaceful purposes—and against the Israel-U.S. axis—at the recent summit of non-aligned nations in Cuba.

The Iranian president expressed dismay that his recent extended letter to President Bush asking for an opening of dialogue, followed by an offer to publicly debate the American leader before the United Nations, has gone unanswered. "I hoped President Bush would respond to my letter to him. My letter was a human act, not a political act. I meet and dialogue with many people on a daily basis." He noted:

> There is no better way than holding dialogue. It can be across the spectrum.Any condition for dialogue is helpful to remove tensions.
>
> We've announced on numerous occasions that we are open for dialogue, but under conditions of mutual respect. Relations can be friendly, balanced and fair.

Expressing his personal interest and his nation's interest in, at the very least, opening up exchanges of scientists and academics between the United States and Iran, Ahmadinejad said:

> We've been urging the institution of a direct flight between Tehran and New York for a long time. We will provide facilities for such exchanges." The Iranian president added: "We were very sorry when the United States refused our offer of humanitarian support for the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

Reflecting upon the possibility that the Bush administration and Israel not only seek to stop Iran from expanding its current nuclear program—which has been the publicly expressed reason for the campaign

being waged against Iran—but also have the intention of toppling the Ahmadinejad government and forcing a complete change in the Iranian system of government, the Iranian leader remarked:

> Of course, we oppose this type of thinking by the U.S. administration. But they will never be able to impose regime change on Iran. Iran doesn't need a guardian. This thinking is part of the past.
>
> Why does Mr. Bush believe that he can think better than the Iranian people and choose their leadership? Imagine me—as the president of Iran—saying to the American people: "I want to save the American people." Think of how the Iranian people respond to President Bush's rhetoric of that type. What is it that Mr. Bush wants to hand to Iran?
>
> Iran has always been Iran, but we have now become independent of the West. Iran is stronger than ever. Iran is a nation of families, friends and neighbors who live like one family, and there will be reactions from the people of Iran to any interference in our nation's affairs.

As far as Iran's alleged desire to assemble nuclear weapons, Ahmadinejad noted that Iran's nuclear program is being supervised by the International Atomic Energy Agency. "It's round the clock, with cameras," he pointed out. In addition, he noted, Iran has signed the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

Ahmadinejad didn't mention it, but the truth is that Israel, which has one of the world's largest nuclear weapons arsenals, has never signed that treaty, nor does it officially admit that it has nuclear capabilities.

In addition, although it is not widely reported by the American media—which portrays Iran feverishly working to build "the Islamic bomb"—the fact is, as noted by Ahmadinejad, Iran's supreme Muslim religious leader actually issued an edict, known as a "fatwa," prohibiting Iran's building of a nuclear weapon.

"In light of that," said Ahmadinejad, "it can be said that, religiously speaking, we are against nuclear weapons. We are fundamentally against nuclear weapons. They are for killing."

What's more, he pointed out: "The Iranian people don't need a nuclear weapon. For eight years, during the Iran-Iraq war, we had a voluntary army—including Christians—that rallied to the defense of the nation. Iranians have a love affair with their country."

Yet, Ahmadinejad asked this: "How can those nations that have nuclear arsenals object to those nations that are trying to produce nuclear fuel for peaceful purposes? The nuclear arena should not be monopolized by a select group of countries."

Responding to allegations that his country suppresses the media, Ahmadinejad noted, with a smile, that:

> If you look at the volume of criticism of the Iranian government and my administration in the media and in academia in Iran, it is substantial. In fact, one of our own government newspapers was recently shut down because it insulted a tribe within our country and that was in violation of the law. So our own government newspaper was punished for violating the law.
>
> Iranian journalists accompanying me to the United States were denied visas by the United States government. These journalists are not allowed to travel beyond the confines of the United Nations building.
>
> But after I was elected president of Iran, some 200 journalists from all over the world visited a small village where I lived for a very brief period as a small child and interviewed everybody they could find: the baker, the man who tended the fruit stand, all of the neighbors.

As far as political freedom in Iran is concerned, Ahmadinejad noted that in the presidential race in which he was elected, "there were eight different candidates from very different backgrounds, representing very diverse platforms."

He pointed out that "Our 290-member consultative assembly is wide-open to a variety of ideas and opinions. It is not run along party lines as you find in the United States, for example." He added:

> Anyone can come to Iran and see that young people, old people—all people—are very politicized and have wide-ranging opinions. They are cognizant of what is happening in the news about the world today and are very much interested in what's happening.
>
> Americans are not fingerprinted when they come to Iran, but people from other lands are fingerprinted when they come to America.

Of the efforts by the Christian and Muslim peoples of Palestine to win a homeland, Ahmadinejad reiterated his longtime concerns that reflect the thinking of millions of people around the globe:

> The fate of humanity is connected to what happens in Palestine. The time for occupation in Palestine has long ended. For a thousand years or more, Palestine was Palestine and nothing else.
>
> However, for the last 60 years we have seen nothing but hostility and bloodshed and tragedy there. Small babies being killed. Homes destroyed.
>
> For what? What is the root cause? The Palestinian people should be able to return to their homeland and choose their own leadership there.

Addressing hysterical charges that he is a "Holocaust denier," as has been repeatedly mentioned in American media reports about him, Ahmadinejad said:

> I have been criticized in the media for asking for scientific evidence relating to events that were said to have happened during World War II. During that war, some 60 million people died. Yet one small group has gained prominence as victims as if other lives don't matter.
>
> In our society today, God and democracy can be freely researched and questioned. There are many books and papers and commentaries published on these topics, but the question of events in World War II cannot be discussed.
>
> I believe, in the spirit of understanding, that we need to do further research in this realm, for the more we understand what really happened, the more we can do to alleviate problems in our society.
>
> In the end, after all, if these things happened, they happened in Europe. They did not happen in Palestine. So therefore, why did the Palestinians have to pay the price? There are five million displaced Palestinians in the world today.

Reflecting in general on the world situation, the Iranian president concluded: "In our world today there are small groups that seek power

and wealth. But most societies seek freedom, peace and justice. We have said we are against the imposition of a unilateral position upon the world. The United Nations must be independent of any single power."

It is not for nothing that Ahmadinejad, on a personal level, impresses even hostile journalists who meet him. He is witty, whip-smart, deeply spiritual and intellectual and as even Fareed Zakaria, editor of Newsweek International, admitted in The Washington Post: "I was struck by how little he conformed to the picture of a madman ... always calm and intelligent." The Iranian president is nobody's fool: Ahmadinejad has established himself as a firm voice against the forces that demand submission to a New World Order.

Whether his nation will ultimately be consumed in a Holocaust at the hands of American military might (even nuclear in nature) or whether Israel—operating on its own (but with very clear American support)—reigns nuclear fire upon Iran with its monstrous Golem remains to be seen. But the fact is that—for the bottom line—President Ahmadinejad is a bold statesman on the global stage who has dared to speak out—and speak forcefully—about the danger our world faces in the ugly shadow of The Golem.

A personal note: In December of 2006 I was privileged to visit Iran as a participant in its now internationally infamous conference examining the issue of "The Holocaust." Following my return from that conference I prepared a detailed report on "What Really Happened in Iran"—quite a contradiction of the endless stream of both deliberate lies and reckless misinformation that was promulgated in the worldwide media, particularly in the United States. This report remains available from American Free Press and can be found in many places on the Internet.

However, one particular portion of that report bears repeating here, especially in the context of our discussion of the ongoing campaign by Israel (in league with its bought-and-paid-for ally, George W Bush) to engage the United States in a needless and potentially world-devastating war against Iran. I wrote as follows—and please read this carefully:

The most important thing that I can convey about Iran in general—my most memorable reaction in retrospect—is this simple concept: Americans need to ignore anything and everything they hear about modern-day Iran, its leader, its culture, and its people from the mass media in America.

It wasn't until I actually arrived in Tehran and spent a day or so there that it became so apparent to me that even I—who fancied myself

as being reasonably well informed about that country—had come to Iran with a lot of misconceptions (prejudices, that is) that were imposed on me (and yes, it's a type of brainwashing) by the major media in America: everything from the nightly "news" broadcasts to the feature stories and other information (largely propaganda, both subtle and not-so-subtle) in the major news magazines.

As our plane prepared to land in Tehran, a message across the loud-speaker was rather jarring. It said that "by government decree" all women were required to cover their heads upon arrival in Iran. I knew this was the case, but to actually hear it broadcast over the airplane's public address system was, even for me, somewhat un-nerving.

Immediately, the mass media's image of oppressed women—being beaten and abused and forced to cover themselves from head to toe in dark, mysterious-looking garb—came to mind.

But I looked about the plane, at the array of women—Iranian and otherwise, dark-skinned, light-skinned, blonde and brunette, Eastern and Western—and I didn't see a single one of those ladies flinch. Not even the richest looking women aboard, Iranian ladies in elegant clothes and dripping in expensive jewelry, seemed to be fazed in the least.

And it was then, as I surveyed the people aboard that plane going to Tehran (from Frankfurt, Germany, my connection point from Washington, DC), I realized in my own mind, for the first time, that these were people who might soon be dead: innocent victims of a reign of fire from the sky (a very real Holocaust) either from American bombers or Israeli bombers or both.These Iranian people, living their lives, traveling freely back and forth from their country to others, are in the gunsights of George Bush and his Zionist allies in Washington and Tel Aviv.

Those Iranians are among the people whom 1,000 American Jewish rabbis—representing, by their sheer numbers, an overwhelming proportion of the synagogue-going American Jewish community—reportedly petitioned President Bush to attack, using American military resources (and risking the precious lives of American men and women) to do it. "If those rabbis, supposedly men of God,' want to wage war against these Iranians," I thought, "then let them do it. But they had better stop pestering Americans to fight another needless war for Israel."

The realization that these living, breathing human beings from all walks of life—these Iranians—were the targets of the wrath of those war-crazed rabbis stayed with me throughout my entire time in Iran, a great burden for me as an American, knowing that the president of the United States is more in line with the thinking of those 1,000 war-mon-gering "religious" leaders than he is with the vast numbers of peace-loving Americans.

So it is that the republic of Iran and its people are now facing death and destruction by a small, yet powerful, group of Zionist intriguers who can only be described as war-mongering criminals with an agenda that is antithetical to all norms of human behavior. They do not represent most Americans, and perhaps not even most Israelis, when all is said and done.

And bear this important point in mind: The record shows that not only Iraq and Iran have been longtime targets of the Zionist war machine. Israeli and American commentators have also mentioned Syria and Saudi Arabia as other potential targets. Even the Southeast Asian republic of Malaysia, a peaceful country by anyone's estimation, was referenced as a potential source of "trouble" in the so-called "war on terrorism" that is being waged as part of the Zionist global agenda.

No individual, institution, or nation that is seen as a potential source of danger toward Israel's dream of a global imperium—enforced either through its own Golem or otherwise supported by the military mechanism of the United States (as long as America remains under the effective control of the Zionist power bloc)—can be considered exempt from being targeted by the fanatics who wield such incredible power on the face of the planet today.

George W. Bush said: "You are either with us, or you are with the terrorists," but what he really meant was this: "If you refuse to support Zionism's agenda, we will kill you." It's as simple as that.

Fortunately, there are those in our world today who have openly stood up to challenge these warmongers. In the chapters which follow, we will have the opportunity to meet some of them and hear what they have to say. These are genuine statesmen who have the interests of humanity at heart.

Chapter Twenty-Six

It's Time to Wage War Against War: Dr. Mahathir Mohamad Speaks Out

In June of 2006 (following an earlier visit in 2004) this author made a second trip to Malaysia at which time I participated as a guest of Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, the longtime former prime minister of that Southeast Asian republic, in the second formal ession of the Perdana Global Peace Organization (PGPO), founded by Dr. Mahathir in 2005.

The PGPO has urged a global campaign to have the conduct of war formally criminalized under international law and to make leaders who perpetrate wars, along with the organizations and businesses that support them, recognized as criminals by international law.

The special 2006, session of the peace forum focused on the theme: "The Middle East Agenda: Oil, Dollar Hegemony & Islam" and featured a diverse group of distinguished diplomats, scholars and others from around the globe who not only addressed the subject of the ongoing role of the United States and Britain and Israel in the problems of the Middle East—in particular the drive for war against Iran—but also the dangers of nuclear proliferation.

In his keynote address to the forum, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad noted that most people view war as "something that happens somewhere else to other people," when, in fact,"war is about killing people—a test of the ability of nations to kill."

Dr. Mahathir pointed out that, today, nations are looking for "new ways of killing," demonstrating that "We are as brutal as ever. We have not really become civilized."

However, he said, "War is not a solution to any conflict between nations. War is a crime. We need to work in the longterm for war to be seen as a crime. People who wage war should be treated as criminals."

Although Dr. Mahathir believes that it is vital for a nation to have a national defense system, having arms doesn't mean that a nation is planning for war. He insists that nations should settle their differences by means other than war.

"In war," he said, "the winner is 'right.' The loser—even if he is defending his country—is wrong, and he may be hanged."

And in light of the current U.S. claim that it conducted war against Iraq to bring democracy to that country, Dr. Mahathir asked,"What is this 'democracy' that the neo-conservatives are promoting?" pointing out that even the new leaders of Iraq are unable to venture out of their protected zones. "Are the people of Iraq free today?" he asked.

"It is undemocratic to kill people to make them accept democracy," he said. And now the United States is considering going to war against Iran, a nation that has a democratically elected president.

Of the current United States domination of the United Nations Security Council, Dr. Mahathir said that this is "a very undemocratic way of sponsoring democracy."

Dr. Mahathir asserted that it is time that voters in all countries insist that candidates for high office give a pledge that they are against war.

World War IV is already here, said Dr. Mahathir, pointing out that it was not he who coined the term. Instead, it was such leading neo-conservative voices as Norman Podhoretz, the longtime editor of the American Jewish Committee's Commentary magazine and Dr. Earl Filford of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, who declared that World War IV is upon us, echoed by Efraim Halevy, the former chief of Israel's Mossad, and others.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld issued a Quadrennial Defense Review Report, dated March 6, 2006, saying that the war will be a "long war" that will last for "years to come." Even Dr. Mahathir pointed out, 350,000 American forces are deployed in 130 countries. Rumsfeld was echoed by President George Bush who declared that the United States was "in the early years of a long struggle" against what he referred to as "a new totalitarian ideology."

The origins of this war, said Dr. Mahathir, can be found in a policy paper drafted by neo-conservative strategist Paul Wolfowitz who, in 1992, called for the projection of U.S. military power with Islam as its target. And now Iran is the latest target. In the same vein as the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, the U.S. Congress has now passed the Iran Freedom Support Act. And the aircraft carrier USS Ronald Reagan warship is now positioning itself for conflict. And it's a very strong possibility that nuclear weapons will be used.

Dr. Mahathir said frankly: "The war criminal Bush has declared that all options are on the table," including nuclear weapons. And yet,"Iran's efforts count for nothing," including the fact that Iran is a signatory to the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty.

The warlike rhetoric and threats coming from President Bush, said the former Malaysian prime minister, "are strong words from the president of the most powerful nation in the world. He has already shown us what he is capable of in the war against Iraq. We must put a stop to this plans and stop the killings."

Expressing his sympathy for the American soldiers who must fight the wars being waged by the Bush regime, Dr. Mahathir pointed out that American lives will also be endangered endangered in the war against Iran: "It is the ordinary man who will pay for the price of this folly, but Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair are protected and safe from harm," noted Dr. Mahathir. However, he said, "Peace loving peoples must mete

out justice. The international community must summon the political will to bring these war criminals to justice."

Dr. Mahathir directly confronted Bush and Blair:"They should not be addressed by any honorific. They should not be called President Bush and Prime Minister Blair. Instead, we should refer to them as War Criminal Bush' and 'War Criminal Blair.' These are the war criminals. Have a good look at them."

Of Bush, Dr. Mahathir said: "This is a man who told lies. The whole nation knows he told lies."And today the United States is surviving on a war economy It is a bankrupt country and its currency has no backing. But billions of dollars are being spent on weapons for wars that need not be fought.

While the mass media in the United States proclaims former Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon as a man of peace, contrast that, said Dr. Mahathir, with the way the media has treated Iranian President Ahmadinejad and former Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein.

Ultimately, Dr. Mahathir asked: "Will Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld and the other war criminals be taken before an international tribunal" to be held responsible for the war crimes that are even now being committed in Iraq? The November 2005 massacre at Haditha—the murder of innocent people—has only recently been exposed. But, said Dr. Mahathir, it was "not a random event."

And referring to the so-called "preemptive" war that the United States waged against Saddam Hussein in Iraq (and which is being pondered against Iran), Dr. Mahathir commented, and, it might be added, only partially in jest: "Maybe if I were still in office, they might have had a preemptive war against me."

In reference to the Israeli-Palestinian dispute and the U.S. role therein, he said that "No way can you have America as an honest broker—a dishonest broker, maybe." He compared the role of the United States in the world today as akin to a situation "when the police chief is breaking the law." The analogy was all too accurate.

In the end, Dr. Mahathir urged all good people who oppose war and imperialism to come together and, he said,"God willing—peace will prevail." Let us pray that Dr. Mahathir's dream becomes reality.

Chapter Twenty-Seven

Israel—A "Failed State" Willing to Break the Nuclear Taboo; Neo-Conservatives Seek World Domination

"We cannot underestimate the neo-conservatives in the Bush administration," said Dr. Francis Boyle, speaking before the 2006 special forum of former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad's Perdana Global Peace Organization. Dr. Boyle knows whereof he speaks. He was educated at the University of Chicago alongside a number of the key "neo-cons" who are influential in the Bush administration today. These neo-conservatives, Boyle declared frankly, are aiming "for control and domination of the world's economy."

A scholar in the areas of international law and human rights, Dr. Boyle is an attorney and political scientist who is a professor of law at the University of Illinois. The author of eight books, including his most recent, Destroying World Order, Boyle served as legal advisor to the Palestinian delegation to the Middle East peace negotiations from 1991-1992 and is an internationally recognized authority in the arenas of war crimes and genocide, nuclear policy and bio-warfare.

The attitude of the neo-conservativevs, Boyle said, is "You do what we tell you to do, or else."

Allied with the hard-line Likud elements in Israel, the neo-conservatives have "no problem with attacking Iran and exterminating hundreds of thousands if not millions of Iranians." Israel itself, he said, would be happy to break the taboo—in place since the attack on Hiroshima—of using nuclear weapons.

An attack on Iran would be a war crime, said Boyle. And although the neo-conservatives know such an attack would be a war crime, said Boyle, "they don't care." They see the use of nuclear weapons against Iran as a way of stealing petroleum supplies in Iran and as also doing a favor to Israel by eliminating one of its perceived enemies.

In addition, in the event of an attack on Iran, Boyle said that Israel itself may use the opportunity to wage war against Syria and Lebanon as a chance to move against Hezbollah, the Palestinian force based in Lebanon. In the meantime, Israel is "starving the Palestinians to death," with the support of the United States, "because the Palestinians had the audacity to select Muslims [in Hamas] as their leaders."

The use of nuclear weapons "is in the plan," and "it's in the public record" and most of the governments of Europe "are in on it," said Boyle. War is not easily localized, he noted, pointing out that after the "local" conflict that erupted after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo, World War I erupted and 20 million people died as a consequence.

In reality, the policies of the neo-conservatives are hardly different Boyle said, than traditional U.S. policy. Since the days when the United States waged imperial policies to take control of Hawaii, Cuba the Philippines and Puerto Rico, for example, "nothing has changed regarding the operational dynamics of American imperial policy." Using the pretexts of "stopping the development of weapons of mass destruction, waging a wear on terrorism and promoting democracy," the United States is, he said bluntly,"trying to steal a hydrocarbon empire from the Muslim states and the people of the Middle East."

In 1967, he said, Israel waged an illegal preventive war and seized land from the Arab states and the United States and Europe came to the support of Israel when the Arabs responded in self-defense. When the Arabs responded with an oil embargo, then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger declared that "This will never happen again" and the United States assembled its Central Command to "steal, conquer and dominate" the oil and gas of the Persian Gulf and Central Asia.

Boyle asserted that Israel is a "failed state" and acts as a "cat's paw" for the United States and could not even survive without the military and economic aid that the United States provides it.

The first Iraq war in 1991 was, in reality, the first expedition of the Central Command and its so-called Rapid Deployment Force, one of 15 years in the making, "one of unprecedented dimensions."The intent was to divide up Iraq between the warring Kurds, Sunnis and Shiites since, Boyle noted, Iraq was—according to anti-Muslim propagandist Samuel Huntington—the only Arab state with the capacity to challenge the United States and Israel.

The result of the sanctions, which followed the first war, was the death of 1.5 million Iraqis. Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said that "the price was worth it." Since 1990 there has been "outright genocide of the Muslim and Christian people of Iraq."

Boyle believes that the United States was complicit in the 9-11 terrorist attacks in the sense that top-level U.S. officials knew the attack was coming and allowed it to happen, wanting a pretext for a long war. He asserted that the United States had long-standing plans for an invasion of Afghanistan in order to grab its oil and natural gas and, after 9-11, "They told whatever lies they had to tell and broke whatever laws they had to break in order to launch the war."

Now, Boyle said,"Iran is going to be the next victim of these outright criminals unless people work to stop it."

Dr. Boyle's warning that Israel is fully prepared to use its nuclear Golem to achieve its goals is one that must not be dismissed. Otherwise the world will pay a mighty price.

Chapter Twenty-Eight

The End of Life on Earth: The Terrible Consequence of Uncontrolled Nuclear Proliferation

Dr. Helen Caldicott, a native of Australia who has spent much time in the United States, is a pediatrician by profession, but she has won international accliam for her outspoken efforts to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The co-founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility and the founder of the Nuclear Policy Research, she is the author of five books and is considered one of the world's leading authority on the dangers of nuclear war. As such, when Dr. Caldicott lectured before the 2006 special forum of the Perdana Global Peace Organization in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, her comments attracted special attention and rightly so.

Speaking from the perspective of a physician, Dr. Helen Caldicott expressed her view that then-U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld—one of the cheerleaders for war against both Iraq and more recently, against Iran—is "clearly a sociopath. He lies constantly and does it in a quite charming way." In fact, she says, there is a distinct "ideology and psychology" among those promoting war against Iran.

Dr. Caldicott said that "a radical change must take place in the psyches of the world leaders and their public," or otherwise "our present path will lead us to annihilation possibly within 20 years but maybe within 10 years."

There is absolutely no time to waste, she said. "Wise leaders must arise who will lead us from the brink of nuclear suicide and who will instigate the dynamics necessary to stop the blind and unconscious rush to mutually assured destruction." There are 30,000 nuclear weapons in the world today, and America and the Russians have 97% of them.

Right now, Dr. Caldicott noted, there is what must be called a "nuclear war" being conducted by the United States against Iraq. She has seen firsthand the results of the use of the exposure to uranium 238 used by the United States in conventional weapons that have been deployed in the two wars against Iraq. The uranium is highly carcinogenic. It is spread through dust storms. It gets deposited in human bone. In Basra, Iraq there has been a 700% increase in cancer among children. There has likewise been a 700% increase in congenital anomalies in Iraqi newborns: children born without brains, with no arms, with single eyes or no eyes at all.

"America is contaminating the cradle of civilization for ever more. This is a war crime beyond compare. This is genocide," said Dr. Caldicott. "This is a nuclear war."

Even now there still remain unexploded American "cluster bombs" lying across the sands of Iraq and Afghanistan. So further tragedies are to come.

However, when Dr. Caldicott has tried to bring this message to the mass media, she has found that the media chooses to suppress these facts. "We're

unable to publish this," she was told by The New York Times.

To their credit, Dr. Caldicott pointed out, British and Australian newspapers have published the information that her Nuclear Policy Research Institute has brought forth, but American newspapers will not.

And now, she said, there are those neo-conservatives in the Bush administration who have been talking about using nuclear weapons in Iran against the Iranian nuclear facilities at Natanz and Isfahan. If just three bombs each were lobbed at those installations, nuclear fallout would spread into Afghanistan, Pakistan and India, and radioactivity would spread downwind, due to global air currents, as far into Southeast Asia as Malaysia.

All told, one million people could die or be injured from the initial blasts. Some 2.6 million people would soon be dead from radiation. Another 10.5 million would be exposed to radiation and to the subsequent dangers facing both the victims and their unborn children. There are simply not enough medical facilities to handle the consequences.

The intended attack on Iran, said Dr. Caldicott, is an "incredible international crime" which could result in further international upheavals. For example, she asked, is it possible that the Russians could get nervous and become further engaged in a conflict with their Chechen rebels? Could other nuclear blasts be in the offing? The end result would be nuclear winter and "the end of life on Earth, the end of creation.

"This", she said, "is the most serious crisis the Earth has ever faced," and since "the American people are determining the fate of the Earth, America's leaders need tough love," and need to be brought under control.

"The United States is the world's bully" she said,"And we are all enablers to America's bullying. Bullies must be disciplined."

And although Dr. Caldicott is Jewish, she pulled no punches in pointing out, too, that Israel (with its own nuclear Golem), has been a major player in the problems of the Middle East and in the realm of nuclear proliferation.

By any estimation this scholar and humanitarian is an authority whose warnings must be considered in this day and age when the powderkeg of the Middle East threatens to bring the world to nuclear disaster.

Chapter Twenty-Nine

"Institutionalized Disinformation": The Media Monopoly's Role in Promoting War

Count Hans-Christof Von Sponeck, a native of Germany; who served some 26 years with the United Nations in a variety of posts, observed first hand the manner in which the United States (along with its allies in Israel and Britain) played a major part in promulgating the lie that Saddam Hussein was developing nuclear (and chemical) weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

While serving as the chief United Nations representative in Iraq administering the "food for oil" program (instituted following the first Gulf War in 1991) and thus charged with the responsibility of monitoring alleged Iraqi weapons development ventures, Von Sponeck came to realize that the Iraqi people were being subjected to a campaign of destruction and resigned in protest.

In the years that followed, he emerged as one of the most outspoken critics of United States policy in the region and has been vehement in his condemnation of the drive for war against Iran.

In June of 2006 von Sponeck spoke before Dr. Mahathir Mohamad's Perdana Global Peace Organization in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and outlined his own concerns, based upon his very real expertise.

Referring to the ongoing discussion of a U.S. attack on Iran, Von Sponeck said that "The global blood pressure is up ... but [the world] is aware of the dangers and there is not an awareness of the possibility of a 'collective stroke' for the world at large," inherent in the possibility of the consequences from a war against Iran.

He noted with particular concern that in the present day, there are not serious efforts to stop nuclear proliferation but, instead, there is actually new research on a new generation of nuclear weapons.

Von Sponeck pointed to the hypocrisy on the part of the Bush administration, which approached India to discuss nuclear deals but which has also condemned Iran for its nuclear ambitions. The former UN official assailed what he called "an incredible double standard in the UN Security Council" that surrounds the controversy over Iranian nuclear development.

Referring to the expose by John Perkins, Confessions of an Economic Hitman, which detailed Perkins's career in exploiting Third World nations on behalf of international financial interests, Von Sponeck wryly noted the tactics used by Western interests are truly "third world," in the negative sense of the term. "The Third World," von Sponeck said, "is not in Malaysia, it's across the Atlantic," referring to the United States. Von Sponeck condemned what he called "market Darwinism" which "is in sharp contrast to the desire for human rights and justice."

The German diplomat commented that, with the Iraq war, one nation—the United States—"decided to leave the community of nations to undertake a policy of unilateralism." To point this out, he said, "is not being anti-American." Instead, he noted, "This is saying that we are looking at the facts of a very dangerous time in our history." Now the United States has, in his words,"artificially created" the crisis in Iran, one which bears many similarities to the earlier campaign against Iraq.

However, based upon his own observations, von Sponeck hopes that there is a turning point coming: "There are still some people in Washington who recognize limitations on U.S. power," and who agree that "it's an insane idea to attack Iran with nuclear weapons,"—something that has actually been proposed in military planning circles inside the Bush administration.

In addition, he said, there are new alliances developing worldwide, economically and politically, that stand as a challenge to the efforts by those running U.S. policy in the direction of a global imperium. "The days of the U.S. as a superpower are counted." Although the US does not want a peaceful solution, von Sponeck believes that there will be worldwide pressure to stop an attack on Iran from happening.

Von Sponeck noted that the 20th century saw the end of colonialism and that he hopes the 21st century will be a period of "intellectual independence," in which people in the United States (in particular) but also worldwide will be able to reject what he called "the avalanche of useless information" and "the danger of planted deliberate disinformation and misinformation" in the mass media that is "all nonsense," particularly in regard to Iraq and Iran.

The time has come and we are now, Von Sponeck said, in a period of challenge for independent "truth seeking media" to correct the lies and deceptions in the major media, what he referred to as "institutionalized disinformation."

The people of our modern era can be thankful for individuals such as Von Sponeck and others who have joined with Dr. Mahathir and his colleagues in the Perdana Global Peace Organization fighting to dislodge the agenda for war and world domination that is now being played out in the campaign against Iran, but one which is much bigger and more dangerous than any human mind can imagine.

And now we will examine the prophetic warnings of an American intellect who—writing some fifty years ago—recognized that the growing power of political Zionism in America and the emergence of the State of Israel, coupled with the emergence of the nuclear Golem, was a critical issue that, for the sake of human survival, needed to be addressed. His appeal to reason remains timeless.

Chapter Thirty

"The Biggest Crime of the 20th Century"
One Prophet's Appeal to Reason:
The Dangers of Zionism, Imperialism and Nuclear Madness

Some 50 years ago an American intellectual with few peers (then or now) saw the inevitable consequences of global imperialism by the United States and the dangers of futile wars in the name of "democracy." He recognized that the rise of Zionist power and the concurrent emergence of nuclear weapons were a combination for disaster. The late Lawrence Dennis (1893-1977) made an appeal to reason that has immense relevance to the survival of America and our world today.

During the mid-20th century—from the early 1930s through the 1960s—Dennis established himself, beyond question, as America's foremost nationalist theoretician.

An outspoken opponent of imperial meddling, Dennis warned early on against American involvement in the affairs of the Third World—particularly the Middle East—and predicted disaster for America (and the world) as the ultimate consequence.

What Dennis said during his heyday is so profound and so prophetic that his commentary is worth resurrecting in these modern times.

One cannot help but read Dennis's remarks—as published in his small-circulation (but still highly and quietly influential) newsletter, The Appeal to Reason (published from the 1950s through the early 1960s)—and reflect upon how his analysis of world events, even then, would so accurately mirror the propaganda and warmongering bombast that led to the American invasion of Iraq and the events that followed.

Although best remembered as the towering genius who stood trial in 1944 (along with some 30 others) on trumped-up "sedition" charges for opposing Franklin Roosevelt's drive to push America into what became World War II, it is largely forgotten that Dennis was also a forthright critic of the subsequent Cold War era that followed.

During the Cold War, Dennis was fiercely adamant about the dangers of saber-rattling against the Soviet Union. He recognized that communism could not survive and asserted unswervingly that American intervention in the Third World in the name of "fighting communism" would only make new enemies for the United States, setting the stage for Soviet exploitation of Third World distaste for American adventurism.

Neither a "conservative" nor a "liberal," Dennis defied (and excoriated) those labels, well before it became fashionable to do so and long prior to the time that honest intellectuals came to understand the terms ceased to be relevant (and perhaps never were).

And in this age of so-called "political correctness," it is probably appropriate to note that although Dennis was of African-American her-

itage on both sides of his family, he "passed" for being "white." While he never formally denied his ethnic antecedents, much to the subsequent dismay of modern-day howlers who demand—in retrospect—that Dennis should have "acted Black" and thereby effectively denied himself the opportunity to become the world-traveling diplomat, economist, writer and lecturer this multi-talented human being happened to be.

Ironically, it has really only been in recent years that many American nationalists of both the "left" and the "right" have finally come to recognize the wisdom of Lawrence Dennis.

Today even Pat Buchanan echoes the anti-imperialist, America First position that Dennis put forth, calling for critics of "Pax Americana" on both the "right" and the "left" to unite against the New World Order, which is—now all too clearly—a mad, plundering war-driving (and war-driven) amalgam of the forces of international plutocratic capitalism and Zionism, united in an Axis of Evil

Long prior to Buchanan, however, independent-minded journals such as Right, The American Mercury, The Spotlight (all since defunct) and now American Free Press and the bimonthly American history magazine, The Barnes Review, were commemorating Dennis.

Willis A. Carto—the publisher of The Barnes Review—was a friend of Dennis and treasures his rare collection of Dennis' newsletter, The Appeal to Reason, upon which is based the following distillation of Dennis' thought regarding the combined danger of U.S. global meddling and support for Zionism in the era of nuclear weapons.

Reflecting upon the intense thought and carefully-crafted writing and analysis by Dennis on the big issues of war, capitalism, imperialism and expansion and his opposition thereto—not to mention the interplay of those forces with the spiral of Zionist influence in the wake of the establishment of the state of Israel and the rise of nuclear proliferation—the reader will be astounded at how truly prescient Dennis was, writing more than 50 years ago.

It is no wonder that a host of influential 20th Century personalities relied on Dennis for his insights: from former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy (father of President Kennedy) to General Robert Wood and on to famed aviator Charles Lindbergh and such free-thinking historians as William Appleman Williams and Harry Elmer Barnes, among many others who respected the dynamic brain-power of this amazing man.

While one may not agree with everything Dennis had to say—nor would Dennis have demanded that—it is impossible to deny that Dennis was a prophet with an articulate capacity to cut to the chase and analyze world affairs in a lively, no-nonsense style. His words are a clarion call for a global offensive against Israel's nuclear Golem.

"The Biggest Crime of the 20th Century" By Lawrence Dennis

The dynamics of religious wars are hate (of sin) and fear (of the foreign devil). This we have. The American people were never adequately told that World Wars I and II and our Korea fiasco were all religious wars [although] I have been very much alone harping on the religious war nature of World Wars I and II and of the post World War II state of permanent Cold War.

This aspect of America's wars since 1914 has to be seen in the light of history and of analogy with the religious wars of the 17th century and earlier. It was not so obvious in World War I as in World War II. The Kaiser and Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria Hungary had no counterparts of Hitler's Nazism or Mussolini's Fascism or of Russian and Chinese communism today.

World War I was turned into a sort of religious war as a matter of practical necessity in order to sell the American people intervention in that war on the side of the Allies. They could not have been lined up for that war by being told it would be good business for the United States or that it was necessary for American defense.

The Americans had to be told it was a war to end war. That made it for them a religious war. Selling World War II to the American people as a religious war was rendered easy by Hitler and his "ism."

Before each of the last two world wars and before the next one, Americans have had the delusion that foreign devils can be prevented or deterred from doing evil if only we do the right things. The right things are building up a tremendous war potential and constantly denouncing the foreign devils for being what they are and doing what they do. When these delusions prove wrong and when the foreign devil refuses to comply with one of our ultimatums, as did the Japanese before Pearl Harbor, and when the foreign devil at last strikes, as at Pearl Harbor, then the American ideology dictates, as up to that point, what action we, as a nation, must take.

The road block to debate is that almost no one of stature with a career or a livelihood to worry about is willing to risk it by telling the American or British people that they made a mistake by fighting two world wars which most of them still think they won.

To say anything like this is to invite the charge of defending the German devils and of arguing that it was not worthwhile to save the world from German conquest and domination. The answer is that the results of fighting to save the world from one devil have been far worse than would have been letting the Germans and the Russians fight it out or of letting the Chinese and the Japanese do likewise.

The answer is that there never was and there never will be just one devil from whom the world is to be saved by crusaders who, by defeating this one devil, can usher in the Millennium.

Non-interventionist America was a great success in the 19th century. An interventionist America has been a failure in world affairs since World War I. In world affairs since World War II, the U.S. has bitten off more than it can chew.

The idea that the British, the Germans or the Americans could, in the 20th century, repeat the Roman Empire of two millennia earlier was widely heralded in this country and the Western world. But it was always absurdly unrealistic.

World unification under anyone formula seems every day less and less possible. Law and force offer no formula for world peace. More tolerance is the only constructive approach to the war problem. War is becoming unacceptable by reason of nuclear weapons. Nuclear war can only be averted by appeal to reason and self-interest.

What is U.S. foreign policy or Mideast policy? It is intervention with force and money in every major foreign crisis or conflict in the name of abstractions like collective security, the world rule of law, defense, and the United Nations.

The United Nations are not united. Retaliatory co-annihilation is not defense. An interventionist policy is unpredictable and uncontrollable. Intervention can't succeed. Only non-intervention and playing a balance of power game could serve the United States.

The U.S. invented nuclear weapons and launched nuclear war ... our contribution to the decline of the west. Therefore, the U.S. must prevent nuclear war by deterring those with nuclear weapons from using them. Absurd! We predict, once the atomic trigger is pulled, total war is on.

A non-interventionist or a neutrality policy, now so often miscalled an isolationist policy, gives a nation like the U.S. far more initiative and power to shape events and determine results than our present policy of unlimited and unpredictable intervention.

Thanks to 40 years of American world meddling since 1917, the world is now in a bigger mess than ever. American intervention with money or force creates a situation or balance of forces which can only be maintained with continued and often increasing deployment of American force and money.

The latest in the international situation is the passing of the buck of defense to the United States by the British as well as by the Israelis. American foreign policy of intervention everywhere serves well only one major purpose, that of maintaining full employment through inflation and maximum spending by our government.

Expert lawyering or advocacy with words for any one side whether for a nation in the world contest or for a pressure group or movement, domestically, will not contribute to peace or better relations and stability. Internationalism, universalism and one worldism are all unrealistic and dangerous concepts or tools of thought. American universalism or internationalism is phony.

We [can] respect any sincere and consistent believer in and crusader for his particular cult of one worldism or universalism, be it religious, political or otherwise, ideologically or operationally, provided he does not propose to put over his one world order by the sword, as did the Christian Crusaders of yore and so many other brands of historical crackpots, or religious fanatics.

But to have American southerners—now as in the past, against racial integration or assimilation—preach internationalism, one worldism, the world rule of one law, and a mushy sort of universalism, well, that really nauseates any rational person.

The same goes for the leaders and voices of organized labor, all professing the deepest attachment to the values and norms of a one world internationalism or universalism, but all opposed to lowering our immigration barriers so as to allow our labor market to be flooded with millions of cheap workers from the colored world.

The organized labor internationalist is a phony just like the southern internationalist and one worlder who is against integration but who would have U.S. forces stationed all over the planet to enforce the world rule of law, while he is now flouting or denying the decision of our Supreme Court on integration.

When the liberals and internationalists were crusading for our entry into an anti-Nazi war, were they any less extremists than are the now so-called conservatives who are preaching anti-communism? The Revisionists are not and never were extremists. The extremist label should usually be applied to those in the war party.

The most extreme factor now operative and to be feared is war, including preparations for war.

War has progressively been becoming a more extreme factor since the middle of the 19th Century. War rolled the national debt up from $43 billion in 1940 to $279 billion in 1945. The Cold War has rolled it up to over $300 billion at present.

Can the extremism of war be successfully met with moderation? Must one extremism always be met with another extremism?

[John E] Kennedy seems to be more of a moderate than an extremist. Unfortunately, extremism, that is to say, some form or type of extremism usually has more mass appeal than a course of moderation. Kennedy

is coming under considerable fire or criticism because he is not talking or acting tough enough for the taste of most people. Most people still do not accurately or rationally evaluate the new war factors.

[This was written on June 7, 1963, just less than six months before John F. Kennedy was killed in Dallas. In fact, Dennis' commentary foreshadowed, in many respects, the subsequent widespread belief that JFK was indeed assassinated precisely because of his refusal to adopt the "tough" line of the Zionists and their Cold Warrior allies who today make up the ruling "neo-conservative" clique at the highest levels of the American government. —MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

Most of the current criticism of Kennedy is based on his failure to make achievements for the United States or to display what the masses of our people like to think of as world leadership.

The Boobus Americanus or the American hick cannot understand why his country, the winner of World War II, should not now be the world leader and in control of the world situation.

Obviously, neither President Kennedy nor anyone of his spokesmen can tell the Boobus Americanus that America did not win World War II but that Russia and communism, only, thanks to American aid, won the war. And this is something that neither the American conservatives, so-called, nor the American liberals, so-called, are disposed to say openly or publicly. The conservatives talk tough against the foreign devil and against more government at home. This is paradoxical and irrational.

What could be more absurd than the demand of the American conservative for a tougher policy against Communist Russia and China along with less government intervention, control and taxation at home?

What could be more paradoxical than being for war and against socialism? The great weakness of most American conservatives and liberals is their failure or inability to take an operational view of big modern war. They just cannot get it through their thick heads that big modern war has to be socialistic.

The permanent cold war now being carried on must downgrade the white world and upgrade the colored world, something our dumb Southerners [who supported] Woodrow Wilson's war to make the world safe for democracy never saw. DeGaulle sees this and wants to end the futile French war in North Africa.

[In fact, in 1962 DeGaulle surrendered French control of Algeria—much to the dismay of Israel—and a major new Arab republic was born. During the same period DeGaulle began severing his long-time alliance with Israel and his support for Israel's nuclear weapons programs, this at precisely the same time John F. Kennedy was adamantly protesting Israel's drive for nuclear weapons. —MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

The day of profitable exploitation by the white man of Africa or Asia is now over. From here on, profitable cooperation only is a rational and practical objective.

The idea or ideal of world unity has for over a half century been promoted by our subsidized foundations. It was never supported by history or current events. Today it is more discredited than ever.

The American people were sold two world wars on a general theory which was most irrational and contrary to the logic of past history and which has been continuously and conclusively proved fallacious by events since 1917.

According to this general theory, a war to end war and the world rule of law could enforce peace with justice. As we have so often repeated, the craziest phrase or idea of the 20th century was that of a war to end war. Anyone who thought a war could end war should have been sent to a mental hospital for psychiatric analysis and treatment.

One of the great insanities of America in the 20th century has been prohibitionism: Prohibit alcoholic drinking, prohibit war. If it is sin, it has to be stopped or prohibited.

The big U.S. idea: The world must be unified by force—ours or theirs. This idea is factually and logically all wrong. But is now accepted as a 100 percent American idea. If you want to be a conformist and not a non-conformist, a dissenter or a subversive, security risk, you must subscribe to this wrong idea.

The generation that started reading Mahan on sea power, Kipling on the White Man's Burden and the lesser breeds without the law, and numerous others on America's and Britain's manifest destiny, also began getting subsidies for embracing these ideas.

The subsidies came from British millionaires like Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie and from American millionaires like John D. Rockefeller. Technological trends and scientific progress were seen to support this "we-or-they-must-rule-the-world" ideology.

World-Unification-by-Force cultists who are against sharing are phonies. These internationalists have a great time denouncing nationalism as selfish, predatory and generally immoral. They are even more violent in their attacks on certain extreme exponents of racism, that is, of a racism other than their own. But they are just as guilty as those whom they attack when it comes to sharing or to setting up a world order based on equality of opportunity and access.

We are prepared to join with fellow Americans in the defense of this country against any invasion by foreigners in search of living space.

But we are indisposed to fight or have Americans fight to protect any other area of people from similar wars or attacks. For such wars, our

advice is that we should keep out of them, try to keep them localized and limited, try to avert or to end them by the use of good offices and negotiation with both sides.

We want no part of wars to liberate other peoples. Let them liberate themselves.

We want no part of wars to defend the status quo in other areas.

Government intervention in all phases of life on the home front has been on the rise since World War I. The Negroes on the warpath in the South are exploiting this trend. They are riding the wave of the future, really started by World War I and greatly accelerated by World War II.

The Southerners who are now fighting desperately the rising tide of color were all for the United States getting into World Wars I and II to make the world safe for democracy. They lacked the imagination or intelligence to foresee the consequences of the crusades the United States embarked upon.

[General Douglas MacArthur said:] "Global war has become a Frankenstein, to destroy both sides. No longer is it a weapon of adventure—the short cut to international power. If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide."

The MacArthur approach to war is not pacifist but operationalist, the line we have taken for over three decades.

The dynamics of hate and fear have run the West in two wars.To get America into two world wars, it was necessary to mobilize and utilize the dynamics of hate and fear.

These factors, of course, were always present and operative in the nationalistic wars of the two centuries and a half preceding the 20th century and following the era of the religious wars. But these factors were never, during the two centuries and a half from 1648 to 1900, as important as they have been in the western world during the 20th century. Democracy only came to maturity at the end of the 19th century.

Whipping up mass hate and fear is the easiest and surest way for a political leader in the western world to come to power and to wield power. It is now the approved way to get a country into a war or to keep it in a state of permanent war such as we are in right now.

The west in the 20th century taught Afro-Asians hate, fear. Now they hate and fear white rule—not communism. They never knew White Russian colonialism.

The strength of [Egyptian Pan-Arab leader Gamal] Nasser today is that he has the rising tide of anti-colonialism or of hate and fear of the white intruders in Africa and Asia to ride.

No political leader in Africa or Asia can have a better asset than to be disliked or denounced by us Americans. That we are "agin" communism is communism's greatest asset in Africa and Asia. The fact we are "for" a local ruler or regime in Africa or Asia is the worst liability for that ruler or regime.

The world minority of whites should have the brains to understand that exploiting or trying to exploit and use the dynamics of hate and fear never was and never will be good business for a privileged "have" minority. The dynamics of hate and fear can, in the long run, only prove fatal for the minority. The white West, or the haves, are the minority.

Permanent Mideast crisis has great headline news value for policy. How could our power elite in Washington get from 40 to 50 billion dollars a year for defense spending and foreign aid if they did not have war-crisis headlines from the Mideast and other areas in our papers most of the time? It is wonderful having a "colored world Hitler" who is nowhere near so dangerous or powerful as was Adolf.

The end result is certain. Time, numbers and space are with the colored world.They are with the Muslim nationalists and against the Israeli nationalists. What the colored world has lacked has been unity and dynamism for war on the whites.

Well, Israel is contributing to the unification and activation of the colored world for war against the colonial and other outsiders.

The [Russians] can't control but will aid and encourage Afrasians versus the U.S.-Israel. Our patriots and fanatical "antis" who want to bear the White Man's Burden over Asia and Africa now that the Europeans are being driven out are naive to suppose that Moscow controls or directs every trouble-making power factor or behavior pattern now giving Uncle Sam, the UN, the western colonial powers or Israel a headache. That is nonsense. It is one thing to aid and encourage a trouble maker and to profit from his operations. It is another to control or direct him.

American, western—and, apparently, recent Israeli policy and action—have been proceeding on the irrational premise that the col-oreds only respect force, wherefore, their white opponents have only to mobilize enough force against the coloreds.What makes this basic premise about force and the coloreds so asinine is simple arithmetic.

The white colonial powers and the Israelis, certainly, can never achieve ultimate and decisive force superiority over the colored world and the vast areas it populates. The western or white world, however, if it were guided by operational rationalism and calculation instead of mystical legalism, moralism and traditionalism, could easily formulate and work out propositions or deals with the colored world mutually advantageous to both or to all concerned. This is our "constructive" word.

Only a return to neutrality, as counseled in Washington's Farewell Address, could really ensure against our government starting and fighting a third world war against overwhelming numerical odds.

Only the substitution of diplomacy for trying to play God or world policeman can provide an operationally practical alternative to total all-out war, if some day, some wild man, somewhere goes too far.

Only rational operationalism and the logic of enlightened national self-interest instead of obeying the imperatives of legalistic, moralistic and traditionalistic absolutes can avert World War III and with it, possibly, the extermination of most of the human race.

As war in the Mideast is stepped up, the U.S. is going to have to send hundreds of thousands, and, eventually, possibly, millions of American soldiers into that area to protect the oil wells and the thousands-of-miles-long pipelines carrying oil to the Mediterranean for export to the Europeans who must depend on it. The American people, of course, will not be told that American troops must be sent to the Mideast to protect the oil stakes.They will be told American intervention in that area is necessary to defend America by stopping communist aggression.

[Although, of course, Dennis wrote this in 1955—at the height of the Cold War—his remarks remain valid. Today, the "communist" enemy has been replaced by the "Islamo-Fascist" enemy and by "Middle East dictators with weapons of mass destruction."—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

If the colored world nationalist leaders can force the U.S. to deploy in perpetuity millions of American soldiers over the colored world to stop communist sin [or, in today's paradigm, "Islamo-Fascist" sin— MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER], what have those leaders to worry about? The more natives American or foreign troops kill, the better for the long run interests of native nationalisms now on the warpath against outsiders.

How can the U.S. ever hope to pressure peoples living so near the margin of bare subsistence? The pressure will be only on the American taxpayers and conscripts for the wars of perpetual foreign intervention with no loot pay-off.

Hollywood couldn't have picked a more fitting war stage than Palestine. In this century we have gone forward to nuclear war and backward to holy war. This is the century of religious wars.

For the opening of the third great religious war of one lifetime, no area could be more appropriate than the Holy Land, the birth place of two, if not of three, of the world's truly great religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

The staging and casting are superb and logical. Zion is the subject of Torah, Prophets, Psalms, Lamentations and many of the great classics of history like those of Joseph and Maimonides. It is the chosen land of

the chosen people. It is under the special personal care of God, or rather, Yahweh, the God of Israel.

Now Uncle Sam has taken over. Of course, Allah is in the other camp, that of the Arabs. Yahweh helped the children of Israel take over the Promised Land more than once in the past four thousand years. But he never stopped their several expulsions and dispersions. This is what Uncle Sam must do in the future.

For reasons which we, like the theologians, are unable to give, Yahweh allowed the Chosen People to be driven out of the Chosen Land more than once. But Uncle Sam cannot permit anything like that to happen to the new Israel.

Uncle Sam is no defeatist. He does not put up with war, sin or aggression. He fights wars to end war. He is a perfectionist.

The believers in the great religions with a Messianic Promise used to wait and pray for the coming of the Messiah and the dawn of the Millennium. Americans, however, today must not just wait and pray for the Millennium; they must fare forth and fight for it—all over the planet. This is the new internationalism.

God never stopped war or evil in all history as Uncle Sam now must do. We do know Uncle Sam is committed to not allowing war or aggression to happen without getting in to stop war. He cannot allow the Chosen People to be driven out of Israel as they were, more than once, in the past. How fitting to have World War III start in the Holy Land.

What will be the nature, the extent, the duration and the end results of America's third war in one lifetime to end war and to stop evil?

Well, it is going to be interesting to watch the American casualties pile up in the Mideast as Uncle Sam tries to stop what Yahweh did not stop in the distant past. And it is going to be even more interesting to follow American mass reactions to the killed and wounded notices from the Crusade in the Holy Land.

America's contribution to religious war in the 20th century [was] mono-diabolism [i.e. the designation of a single "devil" enemy]. Now that Uncle Sam has taken over and is trying to do a job Yahweh never did, Uncle Sam can never admit any imputation of sin or evil against one of his allies or proteges.

One "ism" has to get security clearance. The other has to be branded as subversive. It won't be long now until Judaism and Islam will be up for security rating in the permanent war. [Dennis clearly saw that—ultimately—in the United States, Judaism would be given security clearance. Not so with Islam. Dennis saw it coming.—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

Nowadays, when Uncle Sam gets into a war, he resolves quite simply and decisively the whole issue of sin or as to who and what are good

or right and who and what are evil and wrong. Sin is always and only on the side of the enemy. This was settled by Nuremberg and other war crimes trials.There is just one devil that is against Uncle Sam or not with him. [And George W. Bush did say it: "Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists."—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

The build-up of World War III goes on in the Mideast over Israel, oil, western colonialisms v. colored world nationalisms and the rationalization that the contest is one between the free world and communism. Israel and our western, colonial powers are our bulwark against communism and the colored world. This pattern is what Sir Norman Angell called in the April 15 (1956) London Times: "The Suicide of the West."

In the 20th century religious war pattern of the suicide of the West, the West is crusading, inflating and "technologizing" itself to death.

It is ending itself trying to end war.

It is preparing with nuclear fission weapons to render the world uninhabitable by way of trying to make the world safe for democracy. The leitmotif is the idea that foreign sin and devils cannot be lived with but must be wiped out.

Well, if man's know-how cannot end war or sin, it can now end the human race. We now have an infinite potential for annihilation. How long can our idealists hold in check their impulse to do good by pulling the global annihilation trigger?

If only we did not have nuclear fission and so much know-how, the current wave of madness might result in nothing worse than the bloody futilities of the Crusades or the religious wars of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

The German ex-Nazi military men, technicians and capitalists are quietly moving [into the Arab world] to cooperate and assimilate. If this does not make monkeys of people in America and Britain who fell for World War II propaganda about German "racism," we don't know what could! [It is interesting that Dennis also commented elsewhere that Hitler was "not rational enough" to have allied with the Arab world, for example, "having too high an opinion of the British and the white race"—a comment that will astound those who perceived Dennis as an unabashed admirer of Hitler.—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

If the Germans now gang up with [Russia] and the colored world anti-white nationalists, whom will the British and the French find to sign up for their third Holy war?

Is the answer: "Just the U.S. and Israel?" If it is, the cards will be heavily stacked against the third Anglo-American crusade.

[Dennis did not know at that point that France would break its alliance with Israel or that, in the period prior to the the second U.S. war

against Iraq, France would emerge as an ally with Germany and Russia against the United States and Britain and Israel. As we shall see, Dennis also noted Russia's capacity to exploit Third World tensions with the United States and, likewise, foreshadowed Russia's defeat after its invasion of Muslim Afghanistan. —MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER.]

Russia has 21 million Muslims or over ten percent of its population, mostly concentrated in areas from which Russia gets most of its oil. The idea that Russian communists can convert to communism and control from Moscow the 200 million natives of Africa and the thirteen or fourteen hundred millions of Asia seems to us too silly to merit serious consideration. But Russia, as the only great power besides the U.S., can profit from the revolt of the colored world against the western powers.

The new religious war rationalization is to call it law enforcement. Attempts at an unattainable world rule of one law insure permanent religious war, inflation, and socialism. About the only subject of general agreement among the shapers of American opinion and policy today, so far as war and power politics—inter- or intra-national—are concerned, is that there must be no return to neutralism.

Most of the rightists, criticizing the Supreme Court's desegregation decision and the use of federal armed force to enforce it, are, inconsistently and amusingly enough, all for American world leadership, American intervention, and American liberation by force of the people enslaved by the red devils of the Kremlin.

The Kremlin Kommunist Kommissars are now making out their former peerless leader and our noble war ally Stalin to have been a devil, a monster and guilty of all sorts of crimes or sin. As to Stalin, the Kremlin communists are following the line of the American anti-communists.The American anti-communists are following the Kremlin communist line.

This is really funny. But it is significant. The point being proved is that our allies under Stalin's successful and victorious leadership, in partnership with us, were just as big and just as bad devils as the Nazis and the Fascists. Stalin's sins were operational inevitables of communism.

The biggest crime of the 20th century may turn out to be the eventual extinction of the human race by nuclear radiation in a war fought with the weapons which we, peace-loving, good Americans are now having our scientists perfect. We are developing these weapons to end war, communism and sin on this planet and thereby usher in the Millennium.

CONCLUSION

The "Israelization" of American Foreign Policy Planning for Global War in the Name of "Democracy"

Iran, Russia, China, Venezuela, "Islamo-Fascists" Who Will be Targeted Next by The High Priests of War?

President George W. Bush may well rank—by virtue of his high office—as perhaps America's most insidious and most dangerous Judas Goat. His role in guiding America into the war in Iraq—not to mention his lead part in covering up the truth about the forces behind the 9-11 attack on America—has cast him as a veritable Enemy Within-in-Chief, so to speak. Now he urges America to fight another war against Iran.

However, the truth is that Bush's messianic call for a worldwide "democratic revolution" (enunciated in his second inaugural address and sounding much like the rhetoric of the global Trotskyite Bolshevik movement) was not really of his own making. His words were written by others far more intelligent than Young Bush. And the origins of Bush's newfound philosophy are very telling indeed. Perhaps what is most frightening is that the rhetoric of the American president—prodded by his behind-the-scenes "advisors"—points toward more and more military action around the globe in the years to come.

Although a documentary, Bush's Brain, suggested that Karl Rove, purportedly the president's chief political tactician, is the mastermind who tells the president what to think, it is now clear—based on solid evidence—that Soviet-born Israeli cabinet minister Anatoly "Natan" Sharansky is the one who actually has bragging rights to that title.

Despite the fact that he gained worldwide attention in the 1970s as a Soviet dissident, make no mistake in thinking that Sharansky was ever any kind of Western-style free-market conservative or anti-communist. Instead, Sharansky was a traditional old-line communist who—like many others in the Soviet Union—simply ran afoul of the ruling regime. But thanks to an adoring international media, Sharansky capitalized on his imprisonment by the Soviets—who accused him of being a CIA spy— and emerged as a much-touted "human rights activist."

Later, after his release from prison, Sharansky emigrated to Israel and soon established himself as one of Israel's most outspoken extremist leaders who damned even Israel's heavy-handed Prime Minister Ariel Sharon—known as "the Israeli Caesar"—as being "too soft" on the Palestinian Christians and Muslims.

*A variation of this essay appeared as the final chapter in this author's previous work, The Judas Goats. However, because the information remains so relevant and all-encompassing—particularly in the context of this current volume—the information is reprinted here in updated form for the benefit of those who did not read the earlier book and with apologies to those who did, with the hope they will find the re-read worth their while.

The role of Sharansky in guiding Bush's thinking is no "conspiraey theory." Instead, disclosures from the White House itself—published, although not prominently, in the mainstream media—demonstrated that not only did Sharansky personally consult with the president in drafting the now-controversial inaugural address, but also that at least two of Sharansky's key American publicists were among those brought in to compose Bush's revolutionary proclamation.

Bush himself told The Washington Times in an interview published on January 12, 2005—even prior to his inauguration: "If you want a glimpse of how I think about foreign policy, read Natan Sharansky's book, The Case for Democracy. It's a great book."

Buried in the very last paragraph of a very lengthy article published on January 22, 2005 The New York Times reported that "The president was given [Sharansky's] book and asked Mr. Sharansky to meet with him in the Oval Office ... Mr. Bush also gave the book to several aides, urging them to read it as well. Mr. Sharansky visited the White House last November." The Times did not say who gave the book to the president in the first place, but to find out who actually pressed the book upon the president might be very telling indeed.

Affirming the Times' disclosure, The Washington Post likewise revealed on January 22,2005 (although, again, in the closing paragraphs of an extended analysis) that an administration official said that planning for Bush's address began immediately after the November election and that Bush himself had invited Sharansky to the White House to consult with him and that, in the Post's words,"Sharansky also helped shape the speech with his book."

It was the Post which revealed that two well-known hard-line "neo-conservative" supporters of Israel—William Kristol, publisher of billionaire Rupert Murdoch's Weekly Standard magazine, and psychiatrist-turned-pundit Charles Krauthammer, a strident advocate for harsh U.S. military and economic warfare against the Arab and Muslim worlds— were also among those brought in to help draft the president's address.

Kristol—in particular—and Krauthammer are generally acknowledged even in the mainstream media in America as being among those we've dubbed as "the high priests of war" who were instrumental in orchestrating the U.S. war against Iraq, was a measure high-up on Israel's "want list" for the Bush administration.

It is no coincidence that the individual on the White House staff whom the Post said helped set up the planning conferences to direct Bush's thinking was one Peter Wehner, director of the White House Office of Strategic Initiatives. Wehner—it happens—is a Kristol protege, having been his deputy when Kristol was serving as chief of staff for for-

mer Reagan administration Education Secretary William Bennett himself a protege of Kristol's very influential father, famed "ex-Trotskyite" communist-turned-neo-conservative Zionist power-broker, Irving Kristol.

So, considering Kristol's wide-ranging input, shaping Bush's mindset, it is really no surprise that, as the Post put it,"Bush's grand ambitions excited his neoconservative supporters who see his call to put the United States in the forefront of the battle to spread democracy as noble and necessary."

Meanwhile, for his own part, William Kristol chimed in with an editorial in The Weekly Standard on January 24, 2005 declaring "it's good news that the president is so enthusiastic about Sharansky's work. It suggests that, despite all the criticism, and the difficulties, the president remains determined to continue to lead the nation along the basic foreign policy lines he laid down in his first term."

The BBC News noted on January 22, 2005 that Sharansky "has in fact been moving in American conservative circles for some time."

As far back as July 2002—just prior to the time Bush delivered a hotly-debated speech calling for "democratization" of the Arab world— neo-conservative Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz was in attendance at a conference addressed by Sharansky during which the Israeli leader put forth the same demand.

Shortly thereafter, when Bush gave his own speech, echoing Sharansky, the Israeli hard-liner "provided an important bit of last minute affirmation," according to American neo-conservative Richard Perle, who—between stints in government, during which time he was investigated by the FBI on suspicion of espionage on behalf of Israel—peddled weapons for an Israeli arms manufacturer.

Although the news of Sharansky's profound influence was not widely known among grassroots Americans, it was big news in Israel where The Jerusalem Post headlined a story declaring "White House takes a page out of Sharansky's democracy playbook." In fact, the Israeli newspaper actually went so far as to say that Bush is "doing [Sharansky's book] promotion free of charge," pointing out that the president hyped Sharansky's book in an interview on CNN.

The fact that Sharansky happened to be in charge of "diaspora affairs" in the Israeli cabinet is significant indeed. The term "diaspora" refers to all Jews living outside the borders of Israel and the "mission statement" of Sharansky's cabinet office says it places its "emphasis on Israel, Zionism, Jerusalem and the interdependence of Jews worldwide.

In essence, this translates into a single, general aim: securing the existence and the future of the Jewish people wherever they are." In short, Sharansky is no less than a powerful spokesman for the world-

wide Zionist movement. And now, beyond any question, his views are directing George Bush's worldview.

Considering all of this, it is no wonder that on January 22, 2005, South Korea's English-language media voice, Chosun Ilbo, went so far as to describe Sharansky's philosophy as outlined in his book The Case for Democracy—now being touted by Bush—as "a blueprint for U.S. foreign policy."

The propaganda line of Israeli hard-liner Sharansky upon which the president's inaugural address was based was virtually a complete turnabout from Bush's rhetoric in the 2000 presidential campaign. This contradiction is a point that—theoretically—should have given pause to Republicans who voted for Bush the first time he ran for president.

Enthusiastically proclaiming in a front-page analysis on January 21, 2005 that Bush's address laid the "groundwork for [a] global freedom mission," The Washington Times—a leading "neo-conservative" voice which advocates a hard-line globalist foreign policy in sync with Israel's security demands—stated flat out that:

> President Bush's inaugural address sends the United States on a new, expansionist and far more aggressive global mission to free oppressed countries from dictators—a sharp departure from his 2000 campaign that warned against becoming the world's policeman ... an ambitious, perhaps unprecedented internationalist doctrine that could deploy U.S. military power far beyond America's present commitments...

For its own part, the Times's daily "liberal" counterpart, The Washington Post, declared editorially on January 21, 2005 that Bush's address was "more Wilsonian than conservative"—that is, recalling the messianic internationalism of former U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, hardly a hero of American nationalists or traditional conservatives.

Effectively endorsing Bush's turnabout, the Post acknowledged that Bush's pronouncement "promised an aggressive internationalism, one that if seriously pursued would transform relations with many nations around the world," saying that if Bush was serious, U.S. policy "is on the verge of a historic change."

James Steinberg, the former deputy national security advisor in the Clinton administration, found Bush's emergence as the voice of global-ism quite intriguing, inasmuch as it is a determined betrayal of what had been traditional Republican opposition to international meddling. Steinberg told The New York Times on January 21, 2005 that it is "quite

remarkable that one of the notions that's been so resisted by Republicans is the idea of a deep interdependence in the world, and now [Bush has] essentially adopted the notion that tyranny anywhere threatens freedom anywhere."

Likewise, Robert Kagan, one of the most aggressive neo-conserva-tive media voices, echoed—from a different perspective—the Washington-based American Free Press (AFP) when he wrote in the Post on Jan. 23, 2005 that Bush's "goals are now the antithesis of conservatism." He stated flatly: "They are revolutionary." What Kagan failed to mention was the striking similarity between Bushism and Trotskyism.

In its January 31, 2005 editorial, AFP had described Bush—not in the same friendly vein as Kagan wrote—as a "revolutionary," and this came very much to the dismay of many traditional conservatives who—inex-plicably—still viewed the president as the voice of American patriotism.

These folks were (and are) evidently unaware that what is called "neo-conservatism" is anything but what Americans long viewed to be "conservative" in the traditional American nationalist sense of the word.

However, Zionist Robert Kagan understands this distinction and that's precisely why he said that "Bush may lose the support of most old-fashioned conservatives" once they realize what his new internationalist policy is all about. In short, conservatives have been "had." And that's why AFP reminded its readers not to forget what Jesus said: "Beware wolves in sheep's clothing" or, rather,"Beware the Judas Goats."

In the meantime, however, Sharansky's influence on American Republicanism—under George Bush and in the years ahead— remains substantial. In fact, there's a new brand of Republicanism, at least according to Ken Mehlman, whom President George W Bush personally hand picked, following the 2004 election, to serve as chairman of the Republican National Committee. (Mehlman left the post in 2007.)

In a March 14, 2005 speech in Washington to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the lobby for Israel, the GOP's then-newly-appointeed national chairman candidly and enthusiastically described himself as a "Sharansky Republican."

What was so striking is that this appeared to be the first time in American history that the chairman of one of the national party committees used the name and ideology of a political leader from a foreign nation—and a figure known as an "extremist" at that—to describe his own ideology.

In the past, there were self-described "Taft Republicans," who sup-ported the presidential ambitions of the nationalistic and traditionally conservative Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio—popularly known as "Mr.

Republican"—who was the undisputed leader of the America First bloc in Congress from 1936 until his untimely (and some say "suspicious") death in 1953.

Later, there were the conservative "Goldwater Republicans" who—under the leadership of Sen. Barry Goldwater (Ariz.)—set the stage for the ascendancy of the "Reagan Republicans" who came to power in 1980 under the popular two-term president, Ronald Reagan.

At the same time, in opposition to the Taft and Goldwater Republicans, there were the more liberal and internationalist-minded Republicans who rallied behind New York Governor Thomas E. Dewey and Wall Street lawyer Wendell Willkie, dubbing themselves—naturally— "Dewey Republicans" and "Willkie Republicans."

And later, of course, many of those same party leaders evolved into "Rockefeller Republicans" following New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller. And there were even a few folks, for a time, who called themselves "Eisenhower Republicans," stressing their so-called "mainstream, moderate" point of view (however defined) in the spirit of America's 35th president, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now, however, the GOP national chairman was not calling himself a "Reagan Republican" or even a "Bush Republican" (after the reigning GOP president who was wildly popular among grass-roots members of his party), but, instead, was hailing a foreign leader—a known extremist—as the role model for what 21st century Republicanism is all about.

And this is a direct legacy of George W Bush who so proudly installed Sharansky as one of the GOP's ideological dictators, betraying the historic legacy of the GOP Sharansky's policy of promoting "global democracy" is hardly in the American tradition, but it's now part and parcel of what the "modern" Republican Party is all about.

All of this, taken together, raises questions about the course of the future conduct of American foreign policy. Already it appears that the hard-line Zionist elements surrounding George W Bush have future wars and provocations in mind.

Although the so-called "global war on terrorism"—targeting those whom the pro-Israel neo-conservatives now call "Islamo-fascists" (conveniently recalling world Jewry's favorite 20th century villain: fascism), there's evidently much more in store, if the rhetoric of "The High Priests of War" is to be examined and taken seriously.

Aside from Iran and Syria—which have long been in the gunsights of the Zionist warhawks—three additional countries (Russia, China and Venezuela) now seem to be special targets of Bush and his neo-conservative handlers. These countries don't seem to fall into the category of

the "democracy" that Sharansky and Bush are so determined to promote on a global scheme, and even a cursory examination of the media coverage and rhetoric from the neo-conservatives concerning these nations clearly indicates that war—either "cold" or "hot"—may well be in the offing. And Americans will pay for these wars and fight them.

America's neo-conservative Judas Goats and their collaborators in the pro-Israel lobby in Washington have already fired the opening guns of a new Cold War against Russian leader Vladimir Putin who is increasingly the subject of harsh criticism and hostile questions about his "commitment to democracy."

Whether Putin is going to be cast as "the New Hitler" or the "New Stalin" remains to be seen, but recent indications suggest that the Zionist war against Russian nationalism has now been launched on American soil. The big question is whether Americans will be hoodwinked and again dragged into another war that need not and should not be fought.

The truth is that the neo-conservative hostility to Putin stems precisely from the fact that Putin has not been perceived as attentive to the demands of Zionist Israel.

And for that reason Putin and the nationalists of Russia are now the targets of the international Zionist elite.

Although the burgeoning hostility against Putin by the neo-conservatives had been widely hashed over in small-circulation pro-Israel publications and American Jewish community newspapers on a regular basis, it was only later that mainstream publications such as The Weekly Standard and The New York Times, to name the most prominent, began to echo those concerns about Putin, almost as if the big name dailies were taking the lead from the other journals. Increasingly, however, the notion that "Putin is a possible enemy" was now being put forth to the average American, through the outlets of the mass media.

Another major concern about Putin stems from the fact that he moved sharply against the handful of billionaire plutocrats in Russia (many of whom also hold Israeli citizenship) who grabbed control of the Russian economy with the connivance of then-Russian leader Boris Yeltsin, following the collapse of the old Soviet Union.

Clearly, as Putin aggressively moved against the billionaire oligarchs who were looting the Russian economy (and then, in some instances, fleeing to Israel for refuge), the U.S.-based major print and broadcast media began increasingly taking shots at the Russian leader.

One American hard-line pro-Israel publication, The New Republic, raised the question on September 24, 2004: "Is Russia going fascist?" asserting that whether Putin personally remains in power or not, there is a growing movement—"nationalist" in nature—that holds great sway

among the Russian population. The New Republic expressed concern that "a fascist revolution" could be in the offing, meaning a movement hostile to the Israeli oligarchs (with international criminal connections) who have looted the Russian economy. Likewise, earlier, in his 1995 book, Russia: A Return to Imperialism, Boston-University-based Israeli academic Uri Ra'anan sounded the concern that post-Soviet Russia may pose a threat to the West (i.e. to Israel and Zionist interests in the West).

These works echoed such writers as Jonathan Brent and Vladimir Naumov who, in their 2003 book, Stalin's Last Crime, concluded by saying that "Stalin is a perpetual possibility," leaving open the theoretical proposition that Putin, or other future would-be Russian leaders, may ultimately emerge as heir to Stalin's anti-Zionist legacy.

In the not-unexpected wake of this, the influential Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), for all intents and purposes, officially declared a new "Cold War" on Russia.

The powerful New York-based branch of the London-based Royal Institute on International Affairs—which is funded by the Rothschild family, who are major patrons of Israel—the CFR was, for years, under the domination of the Rockefeller family of the United States.

In recent years, however, a major pro-Israel financier, Maurice "Hank" Greenberg, has emerged as a key figure behind the CFR. Likewise, although—in the past—the CFR was often described (in Jewish-controlled media outlets) as the foreign policy voice of the so-called White Anglo-Saxon Protestant establishment, the truth is that the CFR has an inordinately large membership of American Jews who are strong partisans of Israel.

In any case, regarding Putins Russia, in late 2005 the CFR announced the formation of a new "bipartisan task force" to study U.S.Russian relations.The CFR was spearheading this new unit to monitor— in fact, pressure—Russia to follow the dictates of the United States under the Bush administration's push for global democracy, a theme enunciated by Bush's Soviet-born (but non-Russian) intellectual mentor, Natan Sharansky. Currently a leading figure in Israeli political affairs, Sharansky has been the guiding force behind the Bush foreign policy, having been so acknowledged as such by Bush.

Some might say it was "just a coincidence" that on Dec. 7, 2005— the momentous anniversary of Pearl Harbor—the nation's two most influential newspapers, The New York Times and The Washington Post —both of which consistently feature the pronouncements of the CFR and the elite (pro-Israel) foreign policy establishment—featured heavy-handed attacks on President Vladimir Putin of Russia.

The New York Times offered its readers an op-ed piece entitled

"Moscow's Empty Red Square." The commentary, charging that Russia under Putin was "becoming steadily less democratic," was signed by the Democratic Party's 2004 vice presidential candidate, former Sen. John Edwards (N.C.), and the Republican Party's 1996 vice presidential candidate, Jack Kemp.This duo just happened to be sharing the chairmanship of the task force on U.S. policy toward Russia that had just then just set in place by the CFR.

In tackling Putin, Edwards and Kemp said, "Russia faces a choice between entering the mainstream of the modern world, or trapping itself in an eddy of reaction and isolation."

The CFR spokesmen told Putin he must shelve proposed legislation that would crack down on domestic opposition. This comes at a time when many Russian legislators and opinion leaders have been speaking openly about the power of domestic Zionist groups that are viewed as troublesome for Russia, particularly because of their international ties and their links to the billionaire oligarchs and allied forces in Israel.

In amazing sync with the Dec. 7 attack by the CFR duo on Putin in The New York Times, that very same day The Washington Post—just a "coincidence," of course—featured an editorial entitled "The Anti-Democracy Agenda" raising the question: "Is Russia a partner of the United States in the war on terrorism?"

The Post then went on to assert "You wouldn't know it from the bitter campaign Moscow is waging to thwart President Bush's democracy agenda in Muslim Central Asia," referring to Putin's support for Uzbek President Islam Karimov and what the Post called "an emerging Moscow-led bloc of dictatorships" including Belarus, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan. The Post scored Putin for lending aid to the leaders of these nations and then demanded an answer to this query: "Is this the act of a partner, or an adversary?" The Post said that it was time for President Bush "to stop ducking that question." Clearly, the Post's answer to the question was implicit in its question.

The fact that these most potent blasts at Putin just happened to appear in tandem, on Dec. 7, struck many Russia-watchers as most interesting and symbolic, to say the least.

Several months later, the CFR report on Putin—ostensibly prepared under the direction of the aforementioned Edwards and Kemp—was released and its conclusions didn't bode well for Putin. The Russian leader wasclearly in the gun sights of the powerful international interests often loosely described as "the New World Order."

To nobody's surprise, the "bipartisan task force" report from the CFR echoed and formally enunciated the same themes that Edwards and Kemp had already outlined in their Dec. 7 attack on Putin.

The CFR report insisted the Bush administration take a hard line toward Putin. The CFR asserted Putin s policies may not be in the best interests of the United States. The report said "The very idea of strategic partnership' [between the U.S. and Russia] no longer seems realistic." In other words, the CFR had declared a new "Cold War" against Russia.

And now on the heels of the release of this CFR report, there are rumors (from sources unknown) that Russia may have fed U.S. military secrets to the government of Saddam Hussein prior to the U.S. invasion of the now-destroyed Arabic republic. Such rumors, having received widespread attention in the major media in America, only tend to feed the anti- Putin frenzy that has already been triggered. However, before American patriots jump on the anti-Putin and anti-Russia bandwagon, they should keep an eye on precisely what forces are driving it.

Essentially, with the American neo-conservatives now moving against Putin, it is as if we are seeing a rejuvenation of the war against Russian nationalism by the Trotskyites, retooled for 21st century geopolitical considerations.

Now—unlike in the first half of the 20th century prior to the founding of the state of Israel—the central role of that Middle East state in the neo-conservative worldview cannot be understated, for the concern about Israel is a front-line consideration in the neo-conservative campaign against Putin.

But Putin and the nationalist phenomenon in Russia that Putin has reenergized is not the only target of Zionism and the American war machine that is now in the hands of Israel's neo-conservative allies.

Although for years, our so-called "ally" Israel was selling massive numbers of conventional weapons and providing (both directly and indirectly) American defense technology (including nuclear expertise) to Red China, this clearly and quite definitively had the imprimatur of Israel's lobby in Washington.

Now, however, thanks to the rhetoric of the very neo-conservatives, the drum-beat for war against China is in the air. Those very forces that helped China build its military machine over the past 25 years are now raising the specter of China as a danger to America. Over the last several years, China is more and more being made out to be a new potential "enemy," one that the advocates of war against China say may need to be dealt with through American military action.

However, those who dare to look more closely will find other forces at work in this anti-Chinese rhetoric.

Note this: on April 23, 2001 the hard-line pro-israel New Republic—published by "liberal" Martin Peretz—took a no-holds-barred stand against China. No less than four major pieces appeared in that single

issue under the theme: "An Enemy for Our Time." On the cover, a menacing photo of somber-faced, machine gun armed Chinese soldiers marched toward the reader.

Then, on April 30, 2001 The Weekly Standard—owned by billionaire Rupert Murdoch and edited by neo-conservative propagandist William Kristol—took a hard line against China in a series of articles hardly different in tone or rhetoric from those in the Standard's "liberal" counterpart, The New Republic.

What was remarkable is that not once did either The New Republic or The Weekly Standard cite the primary element that has cranked up the massive (and growing) Chinese war machine to where it is today: Israel's little-known (but absolutely preeminent) role in massive arms transfers to China—including critical nuclear technology—over the past 50 years.This surprised no one who knew that both The New Republic and The Weekly Standard—despite their cosmetic "liberal" and "conservative" differences—have both been loud and enthusiastic media outlets for the propaganda of the pro-Israel lobby: Israel can do no wrong— and that includes arming China.

Make no mistake. Throughout its history—one that predates that of the United States by tens of centuries—China (long before it fell into the hands of the communists) always had its own geopolitical agenda and always will. However, the question must be raised as to whether China should be considered an "enemy" of America.

Why—suddenly—have influential "conservative" and "liberal" voices representing Zionist interests joined forces to beat the drum for war against China?

Don't jump to the happy conclusion that "the liberals have finally wised up." Instead, it's time for American patriots to wise up.

China is now being designated, in the words of The New Republic, as "the enemy for our time." In the past it was the Kaiser. Then Adolf Hitler. Then the Soviet Union. And now, along with the Muslim world, China is suddenly in the gunsights of "The High Priests of War.'There is a bigger agenda at work. There's a "long struggle with China that lies ahead," said The New Republic, and, not surprisingly, The Weekly Standard agreed.

In recent days, similar "concerns" about China have been raised in a wide variety of influential journals—especially in the Sharansky-Bush-Neoconservative realm—and there is much commentary in the mass media that repeatedly reverts to the theme that China is an "enemy" or "potential enemy." The list of such anti-Chinese posturing is endless, but here's a notable and preeminent example:

Writing in the neo-conservative Washington Times on November

15, 2005, Frank Gaffney, Jr, went so far as to say that George W. Bush should make it clear to the Chinese rulers that the power of the United States might well be used in "helping the Chinese people liberate themselves from a regime that oppresses them and increasingly threatens us."

The aforementioned Gaffney is a longtime high-level player in the pro-Israel neo-conservative network in Washington going back to his days as an aide (alongside the ubiquitous Zionist geopolitical mastermind, Richard Perle) to then-Senator Henry M.Jackson (D-Wash.), one of Israel's loudest cheerleaders on Capitol Hill. So Gaffney's warmongering is not simply the ranting of a little-noticed agitator.

The fact that these pro-Israel voices are so intent on raising up arms against China—when, from the beginning, it was their favorite nation, Israel, that was arming China in the first place—is an intriguing phenomenon. Even in the midst of the so-called Cold War against the USSR, Western capitalist elites were engaged in lucrative business deals with the Kremlin, with such banks as Chase Manhattan and other big corporate names lining up to do business with their "anti-capitalist" foes.

And as we noted in The High Priests of War, it was the hard-line "neo-conservative" supporters of Israel who played a major role in stoking up anti-Soviet feelings in the United States, raising the specter of what was actually a highly over-estimated "Soviet arms buildup" when, in fact, the USSR was on the verge of collapse.

In addition, the "no-win" wars conducted in Korea and Vietnam were part of the bigger scheme. Along the way, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the ayatollahs of Iran and later Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadenijad—among others—were given prominent places in the media-orchestrated pantheon of villainy.

The American people—clearly and contrary to what they may say or want to believe—seem to love war.And the plutocrats and their puppet press (in league with the Zionist power brokers) are always ready to come up with a new one to satisfy the popular demand.

Today, the American people are being told by the "conservative" and "liberal" opinion-makers, who function as propaganda voices for the plutocratic elite who control the major media, to be prepared for war.

And if we aren't about to take on China, we have a new "enemy" just a few hours south who is conveniently placed for old-fashioned American "gunboat diplomacy."

Hugo Chavez—the colorful Venezuelan nationalist strongman—is now officially a target of the imperialist neo-conservative pro-Israel network that indisputably directs policy inside the Bush administration.

Although the major media portrayed television evangelist Pat Robertson's call for the United States to assassinate Chavez as some sort

of reckless outburst—which the Bush administration formally, if not convincingly, denounced and for which Robertson offered his own less-than-sincere "apology "—the record shows that the pro-Israel"neo-cons" have had Chavez's image on their dartboard for some time now.

The fact is that since Chavez first came to power in 1999, the neo-conservative "High Priests of War"—along with their allies in pro-Israel journals and propaganda outlets in the United States and worldwide— had been muttering ominously that Chavez and his government are hostile to the interests of Israel and therefore "anti-Semitic."

Chavez and his supporters (quite correctly) saw Robertson's remarks as a "trial balloon" launched by Robertson in collaboration with the Bush administration—a scheme to focus attention on Chavez, perceived as an enemy of Israel and of imperialism

Probably not coincidentally, Robertson's call for Chavez's murder came on August 22, 2005, just shortly after the neo-conservative journal, The Weekly Standard, slammed Chavez in its Aug. 8 issue, claiming Chavez was "a threat to more than just his own people" and that Chavez was a threat to the tiny but wealthy Jewish population in Venezuela— roughly 22,000 people in a nation of 22 million.

The Standard bemoaned the fact Venezuelan state television broadcast a report speculating that Israel's Mossad, may have been linked to the assassination of a local official in Venezuela. Police officials conducted a raid on a Jewish school believed by the government to be housing weapons that may have been involved in the crime.

This act of national defense, against a perceived threat from the spy agency of a foreign power—Israel—was presented by the Standard as some sort of Adolf Hitler-style Gestapo action.

Asserting that "hostility to Jews has become one of the hallmarks of the Venezuelan government," the Standard cited a U.S. State Department "Report on Global Anti-Semitism" that purported to document, in the Standards words,"how openly anti-Semitic the Venezeulan government now is." Of particular concern to the pro-Israel journal was that one of Chavez's closest advisors was the late Norberto Ceresole.

Described as "an Argentinian writer infamous for his books denying the Holocaust and his conspiracy theories about Jewish plans to control the planet," Ceresole's book hailing Chavez forcefully raised questions in its opening chapter about Zionist influence worldwide.

Chavez has refused to back down in the face of Zionist criticism. In 2000, when he announced a trip to Iraq to visit Saddam Hussein, Chavez taunted neo-conservative media critics by saying, "Imagine what the Pharisees will say when they see me with Saddam Hussein."

Actually, complaints by Israel's supporters against Chavez go back

to his first years in office. In 2000, the Stephen Roth Institute on Anti-Semitism and Racism at the Tel Aviv University in Israel issued a report on Anti-Semitism Worldwide 1999/2000 which targeted Chavez in no uncertain terms, declaring:

> Venezuela has undergone a dramatic political transformation since the 1998 general elections, which has had a negative impact on the Jewish community. The new administration's cool stance toward the community and toward Israel has encouraged anti-Semitism, evidenced particularly in the mainstream press . . . Some observers [point] to the president's close relations with Libya, Iraq and Iran, which would serve to explain his hostility toward Israel as well.

The report also raised the specter of Chavez's friendship with the aforementioned Ceresole—"the well-known Argentine anti-Semite"—driving home the point that Chavez is considered an enemy of Israel.

Meanwhile, although Americans who heard of Robertson's provocation against Chavez were told by the media that Chavez was a "leftist" and a "friend of Fidel Castro"—charges certain to inflame many Americans—the fact the pro-Israel network had an axe to grind with Chavez was kept under wraps. The Israeli lobby's criticisms of Chavez were confined to small-circulation—but influential—journals (such as The Weekly Standard) read almost exclusively by pro-Israel fanatics such as Robertson and other "hard-liners."

However, in order to manipulate Americans, the major media helped the Bush administration by stoking up fears of Chavez as a new "communist threat" when nothing could be further from the truth. Actually, Chavez models himself (and his revolution) on the tradition of Simon Bolivar, who liberated the Andean provinces from the Spanish imperial crown and who (even in traditional American history texts) has been called "The George Washington of South America."

Although Chavez is a critic of rampant global super-capitalism, which he calls "the demon," Alma Guillermoprieto pointed out in the October 6, 2005 edition of The New York Review of Books that "a great many businessmen have prospered under his rule, and he has made it clear he sees a significant role for the private sector and, most particularly, for foreign investment." So Chavez is hardly a "communist"—media disinformation notwithstanding. And as far as Castro, who is in his twilight, is concerned, the fact Chavez has been friendly toward Castro—as have been virtually all South American leaders, not to mention those

worldwide—is hardly "proof" Chavez is a "communist."

However, when Robertson went on his 700 Club—which is "must" viewing among many grass-roots Republicans—and called for Chavez's murder, he was sending a message loud and clear: "We don't like Chavez." The "we" in this case were the neo-conservatives and their allies in Israel who collaborate closely with Robertson and other "Christian Right" television evangelists who have provided the Israeli lobby with a fervent (and powerful) base of support.

In the end, all of this globalist saber-rattling in the name of some ill-defined form of "democracy" as divined by George W. Bush's philosophical mentor, Natan Sharansky, is hardly winning America any new friends abroad. If anything, it is making America more enemies and laying the groundwork for foreign policy disasters of the future..

In the meantime, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, often described as the "Father of Modern Malaysia" and long respected as a voice for the developing countries, is not backing down in the face of these war-like provocations. He has been speaking out—with passion and with candor.

In a 2005 interview with Britain's Guardian newspaper, the longtime Malaysian prime minister (who retired in 2003) declared the Bush administration a "rogue regime" and denounced Bush ally, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, as a "proven liar" for having propagated disinformation put forth by Bush and his pro-Israel policy advisors.

The outspoken Malaysian, who is highly regarded throughout the Third World, created a major stir in 2003 when—in the course of an extended lecture before an international gathering of leaders from Muslim countries—he stated that "Jews rule the world by proxy," only one brief comment in a lengthy discourse, but one that was enough to incite a global media frenzy. However, Dr. Mahathir told the Guardian that he was not prepared to withdraw his remarks. He said:

> [American] politicians are scared stiff of the Jews because anybody who votes against the Jews will lose elections. The Jews in America are supporting the Jews in Israel. Israel and other Jews control the most powerful nation in the world.
>
> And that is what I mean [about Jews controlling the world]. I stand by that view.

Dr. Mahathir's pointed comments about the behavior of the United States, particularly vis-a-vis its engagement in the Middle East, reflect not only Muslim opinion, but growing opinion in Europe and elsewhere. Dr. Mahathir told the Guardian:

> The U.S. is the most powerful nation. It can ignore the world if it wants to do anything. It breaks international law. It arrests people outside their countries; it charges them under American law. It kills them ...
>
> That is terror [and] the U.S. is as guilty of terrorism as the people who crashed their planes into the buildings ... Bush doesn't understand the rest of the world. He thinks everybody should be a neocon like him.

Coming from one of the world's foremost Muslim leaders—and one who has urged his fellow Muslims to reject terrorism and extremism— Dr. Mahathir's assessment of the declared U.S. war on terrorism is particularly pointed and a very real caution to American policy-makers who are wedded to the interests of Israel:

> Even if you get bin Laden, you can't be sure there won't be another bin Laden. You cannot get terrorists to sign a peace treaty.
>
> The only way to beat terror is to go for the basic-causes. They don't blow themselves up for no reason, they're angry, they're frustrated.
>
> And why are they angry? Look at the Palestinian situation. Fifty years after you created the state of Israel, things are going from bad to worse.
>
> If you don't settle that, there will be no end to the war on terror. For how long are you going to go on examining people's shoes?

Lest anyone dismiss Dr. Mahathir's comments as "a conspiracy theory from the Muslim world," recall that, as noted earlier, the New York-based Forward, the eminent Jewish newspaper, reported on May 11, 2005 that Barry Jacobs of the American Jewish Committee had charged that there are high-ranking officials in the U.S. intelligence community who are hostile to Israel and waging war against pro-Israel lobbyists and their neo-conservative allies in the Bush administration.

Forward reported that Jacobs believes, in Forward's summary, that "the notion that American Jews and Pentagon neo-conservatives conspired to push the United States into war against Iraq, and possibly also against Iran, is pervasive in Washington's intelligence community."

In fact, Jacobs' concerns are valid as we have demonstrated quite thoroughly in this volume. There is a growing concern about the vast influence of the Jewish lobby in America—as there should be.

The point is that the policies of George W. Bush are not just a cause of concern to those in the Arab and Muslim worlds, or in Russia, China or even Venezuela. There are many good Americans (including those in high places) who see real danger in these policies. And there are many people around the world who recognize that those Americans share their concerns.

As one effort to throw a roadblock in the way of imperialism and wars to advance imperialism, Malaysia's Dr. Mahathir assembled the Perdana Global Peace Organization which we referenced earlier in this work. On December 17, 2005 Dr. Mahathir and those attending a special forum of the organization, announced the Kuala Lumpur Initiative to Criminalize War. As its name implies, the initiative and the efforts to promote its message constitute a serious call for a global drive to make the conduct of war a criminal act. The initiative reads as follows:

> THE KUALA LUMPUR INITIATIVE TO CRIMINALIZE WAR
>
> The Kuala Lumpur Global Peace Forum of concerned peoples from all five continents
>
> UNITED in the belief that peace is the essential condition for the survival and well-being of the human race,
>
> DETERMINED to promote peace and save succeeding generations from the scourge of war,
>
> OUTRAGED over the frequent resort to war in the settlement of disputes between nations,
>
> DISTURBED that militarists are preparing for more wars,
>
> TROUBLED that use of armed force increases insecurity for all,
>
> TERRIFIED that the possession of nuclear weapons and the imminent risk of nuclear war will lead to the annihilation of life on earth.
>
> To achieve peace we now declare that:
>
> • Wars increasingly involve the killing of innocent people and are, therefore, abhorrent and criminal.
>
> • Killings in war are as criminal as the killings within societies in times of peace.
>
> • Since killings in peace time are subject to the domestic law of crime, killings in war must likewise be subject to the international law of crimes. This should be so irrespective of whether these killings in war are authorized or permitted by domestic law.

• All commercial, financial, industrial and scientific activities that aid and abet war should be criminalised.

• All national leaders who initiate aggression must be subjected to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.

• All nations must strengthen the resolve to accept the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and institute methods to settle international disputes by peaceful means and to renounce war.

• Armed force shall not be used except when authorised by a Resolution passed by two-thirds majority of the total membership of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

• All legislators and all members of Government must affirm their belief in peace and pledge to strive for peace.

• Political parties all over the world must include peace as one of their principal objectives.

• Non-Governmental Organisations committed to the promotion of peace should be set up in all nations.

• Public servants and professionals, in particular in the medical, legal, educational and scientific fields, must promote peace and campaign actively against war.

• The media must actively oppose war and the incitement to war and consciously promote the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

• Entertainment media must cease to glorify war and violence and should instead cultivate the ethos of peace

• All religious leaders must condemn war and promote peace.

To these ends the Forum resolves to establish a perma nent Secretariat in Kuala Lumpur to:

IMPLEMENT this Initiative.

OPPOSE policies and programmes that incite war. SEEK the cooperation of [non-governmental organizations] worldwide to achieve the goals of this Initiative.

American nationalists—America's real patriots—share the spirit of the Kuala Lumpur Initiative. And Americans need to rally together—and with others around the globe—to stand in the way of the imperial warmongers. We need to take a very careful second look before "rallying around the flag" and jumping on the pro-war bandwagon—or bandwagons—being assembled before our eyes.

George Bush is supposed to leave office in January of 2009. However, there will be others who will attempt to further the dangerous imperial policies spawned during the Bush era of lies and misrule. And it is the job of all good Americans—and their many friends around the world—to work together to bring these intriguers to their knees.

A final word . . .

What is to be done?

This volume was never intended as a scientific analysis (or an historical overview) of the state of Israel's arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. The truth is that only the Israelis know precisely the extent of the power and capability of their Golem. And the history (or at least much of it) of Israel's nuclear ambitions has already been examined elsewhere. Instead, our purpose in this work has been to examine the very real danger posed by Israel's Hell Bomb, a danger that is magnified, as we have seen, by the fact that Israel's leaders—both those in the so-called "mainstream" and those on the so-called "margin" (which moves ever closer to the center)—are quite capable of unleashing The Golem if they deem such action necessary.

There is no other nation on the face of the globe that has placed nuclear weapons at the center of its very existence.

There is no other nation in our world today that perceives its nuclear arsenal to be something sacred.

And let it also be added that, in fact, there is no other nation anywhere that has incorporated into its founding philosophy the concept that its people are a "chosen people" who have a special place in the eye of God, that they are superior to all others.

Although ethnic and religious rivalries and prejudices have often been at the center of controversies all across the globe, there is no other nation—except Israel—that ranks its own people to be ultimately superior to all other peoples and cultures everywhere on this earth.

And yet, despite all of this, Israel itself is a nation that—even within—is rent with domestic turmoil that is inevitably made all the more distressing by ongoing signs of massive corruption and mismanagement, details of which occasionally pop up in the Western press.

So it is that the stability—and very future—of Israel, as a nation, is one that remains in doubt.

While Israel and its partisans would have us believe that "the Arabs" and "the Muslims" are the greater threat to Israel's survival, the reality is that Israel itself is the greatest threat to its own future and that of the Jewish people as a whole.

Although many people (particularly Americans, influenced by the mass media) perceive Israel to be a united and thriving "democracy," nothing could be further from the truth.

The conflict between factions among the Jewish elite (and the people) of Israel is, at some times, almost as bitter as the conflict between Israel and the peoples of the Arab world.

So when all is said and done, the tiny nation of Israel stands out as a tinderbox of the first and worst order—its endless conflicts with its neighbors only adding to the danger.

Yet, this troubled and troublesome nation of some 5,000,000 people—roughly the size of the state of New Jersey—holds the world hostage. It is that simple.

Through the sheer clout of its lobby in Washington—one which undeniably dictates American foreign policy—coupled with the presence of Israel's nuclear Golem (which, by its existence gives Israel's Washington lobby even further influence) this troubled and troubling racist state (no democracy by any stretch of the imagination) can and must now be counted—horrifyingly enough—as one of the most powerful nations on the face of the planet—if not the most powerful bar none—by virtue of Israel's effective domination of America's media (and thus the American government itself).

It was Israel—and Israel alone—that brought America into the shameful and destructive war against Iraq, one that has displaced millions from their homes in a nation that once thrived.

How many future terrorists have been spawned among young Iraqis who now are living and or destined to live either in exile or in squalid refugee camps, on war-torn streeets and in bombed-out buildings in once prosperous cities and villages ravaged by the Israeli-directed American invasion of their native land.

Today the United States stands on the brink of another needless war against the people of Iran. And, again, it is a war "made in Israel."

Israel has driven a wedge between not only the United States and the Arab peoples of the Middle East, but also between the United States and Muslims worldwide, not to mention millions upon millions of other good peoples who resent America's global machinations carried out at the direction of Israel and its lobby in Washington.

American politicians and policy makers, academics and military leaders, intelligence officers and diplomats, are all under the gun: those who dare to speak out in opposition to the intrigues of Israel are threatened, blackmailed, boycotted, smeared and, yes, assassinated.

At home in America, measures have been put in place—legislation such as the so-called "Patriot" Act—that, while ostensibly designed to "fight terrorism," are nothing more than old-fashioned police-state-style mechanisms to curtail dissent and set in place an authoritarian regime

The present is very ugly indeed. But the future stands to be much worse, unless, of course, Americans and others stand together to put an end to this madness, before it's too late. And there's no question about it.As I've said before: The time has come. Something has got to be done.

What, then, is to be done?

First of all, retired American military officers and veterans of all ranks who understand the nature of Israel's pernicious influence on American policy must band together to use their good will among the American people to publicize this danger. They must once again step forward, as they did before, to defend America. And they will have the support of most grassroots Americans if they dare to do it.

Our American war veterans must move into the forefront of the political arena, if not as candidates then as unyielding public voices for peace, challenging the power of the Israeli lobby in America.

Office-seekers who tout their allegiance to Israel need to be publicly and loudly denounced, shouted down, exposed as the bought-and-paid-for shills that they are. Americans must forget about niceties and put aside the tired old theory that public officials are due respect. Any politician who continues to support Israel is due no respect. Any politician who supports Israel should be driven out of office.

Americans need to wage vocal public protests outside the real corridors of power. Americans need to forget about picketing the White House and Congress. Instead of bringing 100,000 angry anti-war protestors to Washington to parade down Pennslvania Avenue, there should be 10,000 angry anti-war protestors outside every synagogue and Jewish community organization in every major city in America.

These are the real centers of political power in the United States, the rallying points for the millions of dollars in campaign contributions that prop up Zionist power in America. Angry rallies in towns and cities across America would alert the average American as to what America's foolish foreign imperial ventures are really all about.

Americans from all walks of life must be prepared to confront their Jewish neighbors and demand that these Jewish Americans cease and desist in supporting organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress and all manner of pro-Israel operations that thrive on American soil today.

All of this can—and MUST—be done peacefully, to be sure.

Americans are good people—non-violent people—but heretofore they have been afraid to confront the trouble-makers in our midst head on. This can no longer be the case.

Americans—including Jewish Americans of good faith who are prepared to defy their self-appointed leaders—must put pressure on the leaders and enablers of the Zionist power bloc and make it clear, in no uncertain terms, that

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

Americans must be ready to stand up—united—and declare in no uncertain terms, once and for all, that there will be

NO MORE WARS FOR ISRAEL.

That simple slogan, repeated enough times in enough places before enough people, will explain—once and for all—what the primary source of trouble in our world really happens to be. People should be prepared to say quite simply

TO HELL WITH THE JEWISH LOBBY!

Israel's nuclear Golem stands at the center of this source of trouble and gives Israel the unbridled authority to conduct its affairs at home, in the occupied territories, and in dealing with its neighbors in the region (and in the rest of the world) in a fashion that does not comport with reasonable standards of law or ethics.

In the not-too-distant future, Israel and its partisans must come to recognize one simple reality: they are outnumbered. The Zionist experiment in Palestine has failed, and the consequence is a world in turmoil, a direct result of some forty years of United States intervention in the Middle East on Israel's behalf, working to salvage a failed state that should have never been established in the first place.

As this is written (July 2007), the Palestinians are at war among themselves—again, a result of U.S.-Israeli intrigue—and the Israelis are once again "playing pretend," now hinting that they are amenable to working with the Fatah faction among the Palestinians to bring a settlement of the Palestine question. But those who know the history of the Israelis recognize that it is "all just more of the same."

Israel must be prepared to share power with the Christian and Muslim natives of Palestine. The day of an exclusively Jewish state, with Jewish superiority and second-class status for the Palestinians must— and will—soon come to an end. The wheel of history is turning ever more swiftly in that direction.

The civilized world must be prepared to move toward dismantling Israel's nuclear arsenal and setting in place a new paradigm in Palestine, one that will do so much toward establishing a just peace that will play a great part in guaranteeing an end to the Middle East flashpoint that revolves around Israel's Golem. Otherwise, there's no question about it: America and the world (including Israel) will be speeding faster and faster down the Road to Armageddon.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Here's what Israel's Prisoner of Conscience — nuclear whistle-blower and multiple-time Nobel Peace Prize nominee Mordechai Vanunu —has said about Michael Collins Piper...

Over the years, much has been written about the creature known as the state of Israel. Most of what has been written about Israel and accepted by those in the West is not true.

Israel has been painted as being a non-threatening friend to humanity, who merely wishes to live in peace with the rest of the world. I have seen the beast up close, however, and I can tell you that this is not the case.

There are only a few individuals who are brave and honest enough to paint her in her true light, and one of them is Michael Collins Piper in his books such as Final Judgment, The High Priests of War and The New Jerusalem."

In a time of tsunamic ideological shifts, in which audacious propagandists are relentlessly engaged in frenzied efforts to rewrite the facts of history, to challenge these truth-twisters Michael Collins Piper arrives: the American Voltaire, an enlightened thinker and polemicist who has no fear of confronting harsh realities, doing so with elegance and verve.

In recent years Piper has emerged as the unrivaled ambassador of the American nationalist movement to peoples all across the planet: from Moscow to Abu Dhabi to Kuala Lumpur and on to Tokyo and Toronto and Tehran.

In no uncertain terms, he has issued a clarion call—a rallying cry—for all of us to join together, to reclaim our heritage and to sweep away the corruption of international capital and the consequent malign force that's come in its wake, driving our world to the brink of nuclear annihilation.

Piper's message is loud and clear: Real Americans do not support the Zionist scheme to exploit America's military might to conquer the globe; that good people who oppose the Zionist Imperium must put aside differences and close ranks, united for the final battle.

Passionate, making no pretense of being without bias, Piper identifies and savages those who manifest attitudes of open hatred for nationalism and freedom.

Having fashioned historical writing into an art form, Piper has few peers. Nor are there many who speak truth to power as Piper does so well.

Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center has said that, because Piper criticizes Israel, he is "anti-American." In fact, Piper's work proves precisely how pro-American he is.

—RYU OHTA, Chairman of the Tokyo, Japan-based Society for the Critique of Contemporary Civilization

How I Discovered The Problem of Israel:

Since I first began writing and speaking publicly—roughly some 25 years ago while still in my early 20s—I have repeatedly been asked (both here in the United States and around the world) how I came to my particular point of view, particularly in regard to the U.S. "special relationship" with Israel. It seems appropriate to use this forum to answer that question for those who are interested.

Having always been interested in politics since I was about seven or eight years old, I actually started out being interested in the history of the Civil War. From there it developed into a growing interest in U.S. political affairs in general. Like many folks I believed in the myth that politics was "Democrat vs. Republican" and later I bought into the theory that there was a real difference between "liberals" and "conservatives."

Ultimately, however, I came to see that the real difference was between the nationalists and the internationalists, and, in the end, it became clear to me that the primary—virtually unchallenged—power force in American affairs was the role of the Jewish lobby and the global Zionist agenda. How I came to that realization was a learning process in itself—and a very personal one at that.

You see, as a child—during the Vietnam War—I was very much against the war because I was just instinctively anti-war. And then I eventually saw the effect that the war had on my older brother, who was drafted and sent to Vietnam. He is dead today. He survived the Vietnam War, but he never completely recovered from the physical and psychological impact of the war. This book—The Golem—is dedicated in part to my brother. Sadly, he was just one of many victims of war.

And yet, ironically—if I must tell the entire truth, and I will—my brother was a firm supporter of the policies of George W Bush. Like many good patriotic Americans, my brother—a traditional conservative—was taken in by the Zionist propaganda of Fox News and other "conservative" outlets rampant today.

In some respects, my brother would probably reject the basic foundation of this book, if only because its thesis runs so contrary to the propaganda line that he came to accept during his too-short life.

In any case, being very, very anti-war, I began studying U.S. foreign policy. By the time I was about 16 years old, I had pretty much come to the conclusion that the primary powder keg—the foremost problem— for U.S. foreign policy was the Middle East. And that was precisely—I determined— because of all-out U.S. support for Israel.

As a consequence of that, I believe that we were victim of the 9-11 terrorist attacks. Whoever was responsible for 9-11—and I do believe that Israel was the prime mover behind 9-11, a subject that I am going

to explore in a forthcoming book—the bottom line is that the 9-11 tragedy was a direct outgrowth of the U.S. involvement in the Middle East, specifically, U.S. favoritism for Israel. Even if—as George Bush contends—radical Muslims were responsible for 9-11—it still links back to U.S. partisanship on behalf of Israel.

Years and years ago I told anyone who would listen that—ultimately— the United States would be the victim of a terrorist attack from the Muslim world as a consequence of our Middle East policy, and while the United States was the victim of a massive terrorist attack, I do not believe—as I've said—that the Muslims were responsible.

But in a certain sense I have been vindicated, at least if George W. Bush's lies are to be believed. And many good Americans believe those lies. But they seem incapable of making a connection between that so-called "Muslim terrorist attack" and the corrupt policies of the American government in the conduct of our nation's foreign policy.

Now, of course, we have found ourselves embroiled in this war in Iraq. And if the Zionists and their controlled politicians like George W. Bush have their way, we will get into a war against Iran.

So, needless to say, as I have always said: The one thing which is consistent about U.S. Middle East policy is the fact that it is based on lies, bullying and double standards. This policy must be (missing text?)

As a consequence of my interest in the Middle East, I obviously did a lot of reading on the topic and discovered that there was one aspect of U.S. Middle East policy that was hardly explored at all in published material on the subject: the fact that John F. Kennedy was engaged in a secret behind the scenes war with Israel, attempting to stop Israel's relentless drive to build nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Having always been interested in the JFK assassination, I soon found in my own research, there was good solid reason to believe that Israel had indeed played a major role in that crime which had such a profound impact on the course of U.S. policy toward Israel and the Arab world.

The publication of my own book on the JFK assassination, Final Judgment, led me into further research in the realm of U.S. foreign policy, and, as a consequence, my subsequent books relating to The Problem of Israel and its impact on our world began to materialize. Frankly, I believe that my body of work will stand the test of time.

In due course, as a result of my efforts, I have had the opportunity to travel to places I never expected to travel and meet many fine people all across this planet who share my concerns.As a result, I am convinced—now more than ever—that in the end there will be a final solution to The Problem of Israel.